

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
ITHACA, N. Y. 14853



JOHN M. OLIN
LIBRARY

INSULAR LATIN STUDIES:
LATIN TEXTS AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BRITISH ISLES:

550-1066

Edited by Michael Herren

This collection is the fruit of a small multi-disciplinary symposium held at York University, Toronto, in 1979. The contributions include work by specialists in manuscript studies, philology, history of education, history of science, hagiography, and literary theory. Among the questions addressed are: texts and their histories in the British Isles, works known to the English and the Irish, composition of libraries, peculiarities of Latinity, the teaching of the liberal arts and of science, and canons of literary theory in Latin composition. Attention is also paid to the activities of the English and the Irish on the continent. The collection is intended to illustrate the unique place of the British Isles in the cultural history of early medieval Europe.

Contributors are Michael Herren, John Contrani, Michael Lapidus, Wesley Stevens, Carnot Wieland, Colin Chase, David Donville, Christian Insichen-Eder and François Kerlouégan.

PAPERS IN MEDIAEVAL STUDIES 1

INSULAR LATIN STUDIES

Papers on Latin Texts and Manuscripts
of the British Isles: 550-1066

EDITED BY

MICHAEL W. HERREN



PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

TORONTO 1981



Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Main entry under title:
Insular Latin studies

(Papers in mediaeval studies, ISSN 0228-8605 : no. 1)
Text in English and French.
Papers given at a multi-disciplinary symposium at
York University, Toronto, 1979.
Includes indexes.
ISBN 0-88644-801-5

1. Latin philology, Medieval and modern - Congresses.
2. Manuscripts, Latin (Medieval and modern) - Great Britain - Congresses. I. Herren, Michael W., 1940-
II. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
III. Series.

PA23.T57 870'.3'0941 C81-09489-0

©1981 by

PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

59 Queen's Park Crescent East
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 2C4

Printed by Universa, Wetteren, Belgium

CONTENTS

Contributors	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Preface	Michael HERREN ix
Abbreviations	xiii
1 Hiberno-Latin Philology: The State of the Question	Michael HERREN 1
2 John Scotus, Martin Hibernensis, the Liberal Arts, and Teaching	John J. CONTRENI 23
3 The Present State of Anglo-Latin Studies	Michael LAFARGE 43
4 Scientific Instruction in Early Insular Schools	Wesley M. STEVENS 83
5 Geminus Stiles: Studies in Anglo-Latin Hagiography	Gernot WILHELM 115
6 Alcuin's Grammar Versus Poetry and Truth in Carolingian Pedagogy	Colin CHASE 139
7 English Libraries Before 1066: Use and Abuse of the Manuscript Evidence	David DUNVILLE 153
8 The Authenticity of the <i>Dieta Canidia</i> , <i>Dieta Albini</i> , and some Related Texts	Christine E. IKERICH-SIVER 179
9 Les Vies De Sainte Brctone Les Plus Anciennes Dans Leurs Rapport Avec Les Vies Britaniques	Françoise KRAEMER 205
Indices	215

THE CONTRIBUTORS

MICHAEL HERREN works on the Latin literature of the British Isles and teaches classical and medieval Latin at York University.

JOHN J. CONTRENI specializes in early medieval intellectual history and teaches medieval history at Purdue University in Indiana.

MICHAEL LAPIDGE is a specialist in the Latin literature of the British Isles and teaches Anglo-Latin Studies at the University of Cambridge.

WESLEY STEVENS is a specialist in the history of medieval science and teaches medieval history at the University of Winnipeg.

GENNOT WIELAND specializes in the field of Anglo-Latin manuscript studies and teaches in the English Department at the University of British Columbia.

COLIN CHASE teaches Latin and Old English in the Medieval Centre, University of Toronto.

DAVID BUNVILLE works in the early medieval history of the British Isles and teaches manuscript studies at the University of Cambridge.

CHRISTINE HEICHEN-KER has taught paleography and medieval Latin in universities in Germany and at the University of Notre Dame.

FRANÇOIS KERLOUEGAN is a specialist in the Latin literature of the British Isles and Brittany and teaches comparative philology at the University of Rennes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The conference, "Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles: 550-1066," held at Glendon College, York University, Toronto, April 18-21, 1979, was generously assisted by grants from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, by the Office of the President, York University, and by the Dean of Atkinson College, York University. The organizer also wishes to acknowledge the participation of the Consulate General of France in Toronto. Special personal acknowledgements are accorded to Professor Alain Baudot, Glendon College, and to Professor S. A. Brown, Atkinson College, for their generous help both before and during the conference.

The present book, which consists of the revised proceedings of the conference, was typed at the expense of Atkinson College. The editor wishes to express his gratitude to the Office of the Dean, Mrs. Margot Hooker, Mrs. Rosalie Friedrichs, Miss Lynn Norwood and Miss Marion Nigam for their kindness and generosity in this effort. Finally, an expression of gratitude to Miss Dyan Elliott and to Prof. S. A. Brown for their patient assistance in preparing the manuscript and reading proofs.

PREFACE

This volume is a collection of the papers given at the conference "Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles: 550-1066," held at Glendon College, York University, April 18-21, 1979. The purpose of that conference was to bring together scholars from various disciplines - paleography, philology, history - who have concentrated their studies on Latin texts and their diffusion both in England and in Ireland (with some forays on to the continent) during the period before the Norman Conquest. It is always to be hoped that a conference will be something more than the aggregate of the individual contributions, especially if a book is to result. It is gratifying to observe that a number of motifs play throughout the various papers - motifs that do indeed characterize and define what may be termed "Insular Latin Culture."

First and foremost we note the deep respect for the Latin word that pervades the literature of both islands. Grammar was cultivated assiduously in England and in Ireland - indeed, it can be fairly stated that virtually every grammatical work salvaged from classical antiquity was known, read, and excerpted by insular scholars prior to the Carolingian Renaissance. In the period when standards of Latin literacy were in decline on the continent, we find an admirable concern for them among insular writers. This concern extended far beyond the requirements of grammatical correctness to an interest in and cultivation of the niceties of Latin style, both in prose and in poetry. But if grammar was the most fundamental of the artes, it was not the only one. Respect was paid to them all; the identification of the seven liberal arts with the seven pillars of Wisdom is a theme that runs through insular Latin literature from Aldhelm to Alcuin to John. Science, under the name of computus was studied on both islands, and what began as a practical problem for churchmen - the computation of the date of Easter - gave impetus to a more theoretical study of natural phenomena. Theology, which had experienced virtual extinction in the West after the death of Boethius, became once again a living subject in the hands of the "Irish Augustine," of Alcuin, and of course, John Scotus. Alcuin,

followed by John, affirmed the role of human reason (informed by the *artes*) in the process of the attainment of eternal salvation, culminating in John's dictum: "Nemo intrat in caelum nisi per philosophiam."

If any one figure dominated our proceedings, it was Alcuin. Not because he was the most brilliant personage on the insular stage - John held that honour - but because he was the most typical. His breadth of learning, his clear Latin style, his faith in the efficacy of education and his practical attainments as a pedagogue exemplify what was best in the Carolingian revival. Yet Alcuin intrigues us here, because, unlike so many of the insular masters who went to the continent, we know a good deal about the native component of his formation, thus allowing us to assess in part what was specifically insular in his contribution.

Inevitably, a symposium of this type will produce surprises, or at least new emphases. A good deal has been written about the cultural relations between the English and the Irish in our period as well as about the impact of the two groups on continental learning. What has so often been ignored in our discussions is the important role played by that Celtic group that had settled along the Atlantic coast of France before the beginning of our period: the Bretons. It is becoming increasingly clear now that this group was a vital link in the two-way communications system between the British Isles and the continent - first as importers and preservers of the early hagiographical materials of Ireland and Wales, otherwise largely lost; secondly, as exporters of manuscripts to Anglo-Saxon England in the latter part of our period. Fleury seems to have been the hub of this activity, and the figure of the polymath Abbo invites deeper investigation, as do the Latin writings of Brittany in general.

The beginnings of our period, from ca. 550 to ca. 800, have been well studied. It emerged from our proceedings that a great deal of work remains to be done for the second half, both as to the cataloguing of manuscripts and to the edition of texts and the study of their Latinity. This is certainly true for Anglo-Saxon England, with the ninth being the darkest century. Whether the gloom results from a lack of study or is indeed the true darkness of barbarism remains to be investigated. The same can be said of Ireland. Few attempts have been made to examine the remnants of Latin culture on that island after the Viking incursions.

The essays presented here are revised versions of the conference papers. Each author has endeavoured to emendate his paper as fully as possible. It is hoped that the detailed annotation will enable this volume to serve as a kind of "Handbook of Insular Studies" (a title suggested by one of the participants), and thus have a continuing usefulness for present and future students in this field. Every effort has been made to up-date the bibliography between 1979 and the date of publication. As editor, I have attempted to achieve a rather general consistency in format and to ensure accuracy of citation. Mayed that, each author must speak for himself. The papers are presented in the order in which they were given at the conference.

I conclude with the hope that the work of this conference can be continued - dare I suggest that the venue be one of the British Isles or Brittany? Whatever site is chosen, let the *arctores* go thither "by the fleetload" to dispute in elegant fashion the mysteries of handwriting. A symposium devoted to all aspects of the insular book would complement in a wonderful way the work begun here.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ALMA	<i>Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi (Bulletin Du Congrès)</i>
ASE	<i>Anglo-Saxon England</i>
BSCS	<i>Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies</i>
C&N	<i>Classica et Mediaevalia</i>
CCCM	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis</i>
CCSL	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Scriptores Latini</i>
CLA	<i>Codices Latini Antiquiores, ed. Lowe</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (the Vienna Corpus)</i>
EC	<i>Etudes Celtiques</i>
E.C.N.	<i>Bishop, English Caroline Minuscule</i>
EETS	<i>Early English Text Society</i>
ENR	<i>English Historical Review</i>
E.E.	<i>Bede, Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
E.F.	<i>Hispanica Fœmina</i>
MAE	<i>Medii Aevi</i>
MGH	<i>Monumenta Historica Germaniae</i>
Auct. Ant.	<i>Auctores Antiquissimi</i>
Post. Lat.	<i>Poetae Latini Carolini Aevi</i>
S.R.N.	<i>Scriptores eorum Merovingicarum</i>
MJ	<i>Mittelaltersches Jahrbuch</i>
N.L.G.B.	<i>Nor, Medieval Libraries of Great Britain</i>
MS	<i>Medieval Studies</i>
PSA	<i>Proceedings of the British Academy</i>
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina, ed. Migne</i>
PIRA	<i>Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy</i>
RS	<i>Revue Médiévale</i>
SC	<i>Studia Celtica</i>
SE	<i>Sacris Erudiri</i>
SH	<i>Studia Hibernica</i>

HIBERNO-LATIN PHILOLOGY: THE STATE OF THE QUESTION

Michael Herren
York University

To many scholars of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Hiberno-Latin literature is a subject that lies, so to speak, beyond the Pale. Not only is the subject thought to be obscure, it is also considered to be restricted, as though it might be likened to the examination of the remains of Varnetic or Illyrian. It is true that our subject is still relatively young; its compass, however, as most of us here know, is extremely broad. Indeed, so much has been done since the pioneering work of the late nineteenth century¹ that any attempt to summarize the field constitutes a formidable challenge. It is therefore essential to be highly selective. This selectivity must of necessity be controlled by the constraints of my own interests and knowledge as well as by those of time.

First of all, it seemed prudent to limit my summary to the scholarship of the last twenty-five years, although I have made a few exceptions. Secondly, I have generally restricted my discussion to what might be termed "the formative period," i.e., 350-800, although I make a few callies beyond. Of necessity I deal with the output of Ireland itself, when that can be established, and with the products of Irish centres in Britain and on the continent. I have thought it useful to approach my task by subjects or issues rather than chronologically or geographically. This makes it easier to establish what has been resolved and to show where further work needs to be done. I have thought the following headings appropriate: (1) linguistic problems, (2) literary features, (3) literary historical questions, and (4) desiderata.

Before taking up these individual problems, it would be useful to note that the principal achievement of the past twenty-five years has

Insular Latin Studies, ed. Michael Herren,
Papers in Medieval Studies 1 (Toronto:
Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1982)
pp. 1-22

been the establishment of good critical editions of many of the monuments of Hiberno-Latin literature. The scholar who did the most to bring this about, in the dual role of editor and promoter, was Ludwig Bieler. If any one achievement can be regarded as the cornerstone of modern Hiberno-Latin studies, it was the establishment of the *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* series published by the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies. There we find good critical editions with reliable translations as well as meticulous indices of grammar, orthography, and lexis compiled by Bieler himself. To date we have (in order of publication): A. Gwynn's *The Writings of Bishop Patrick* (1955), G. S. M. Walker's *Sancti Columbani Opera* (1957), D. Macdonald's *Adamnan's De Locis Sanctis* (1958), M. Esposito's *Itinerarium Symonis Semonis Ab Hybernia ad Terram Sanctam* (1960), Bieler's *The Irish Penitentials* (1963), J. J. Tierney's *Decem Libri de Mensura Orbis Terrae* (1967), I. P. Sheldons-Williams' *Johannis Scotti Eriugena Periphyseon* (part I, 1968; part II, 1972), and Bieler's *Four Latin Lives of Saint Patrick* (1970). (Other works intended for this series will be noted below.) It is to be regretted that the Dublin Institute lacked the funding necessary to achieve greater completeness in publications. A number of editions that would have been very appropriate to this series had to find a niche elsewhere. Two series in particular have offered accommodation to Hiberno-Latin projects: *Studies and Texts of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies* Press, Toronto, which has published my *Hesperios Famae I: The A-Text* (1974) and D. Brexley's *Commentum Sedulii Scotti in Maiores Donatum Grammaticus* (1975). The second is the *Corpus Christianorum* of Turnhout, Belgium, which has recently published a good number of Hiberno-Latin grammatical and exegetical works. The grammatical works appeared in the *Continuatio Mediaevalis* division of that series, vols. 40-40C. They are: Louis Holtz's *Purethach: In Donati Artem Maiores* (40, 1977); Bengt Löffstedt's *Ars Laurensheimensis* (40A, 1977); *Sedulii Scotti in Donati Artem Maiores* (40B, 1977); *Sedulii Scotti in Donati Artem Minorem, in Priscianum, in Butychum* (40C, 1977). One volume of exegesis appeared in the same series: J. Barbet's *Johannis Scotti Eriugena Expositiones in Terentium Coelestem* (30, 1975). Other volumes of exegesis appeared in the *Series Latina* section: G. Morin's *S. Hieronymi in Ezechielem Parvula Adhreviatio* (73A, 1963), M. Adriaen's edition of Lathan's *Eclogae Moralium Gregorii in Job* (145, 1969), R. E. McElroy's *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores Pars I* (108B, 1973), and Joseph Kelly's *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores Pars II*

(180C, 1974). (I have just learned of the appearance of G. Madec's *Johannis Scotti de Divina Praedestinatione Liber in the Continuatio Mediaevalis* [50, 1978].)

A number of important editions appeared outside the aegis of the above-named series. Among these are A. O. and M. O. Anderson's edition of Adamnan's *Life of Columba* (London, 1962), Bengt Löffstedt's *Der hibernolatinische Grammatiker Maelsachanus* (Uppsala, 1965), M. C. Diaz y Diaz's edition of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Liber de Ordine Creaturarum* (Santiago de Compostela, 1972), Edouard Jeuneau's editions of Eriugena's exegetical works in *Sources Chrétiennes* no. 151 (1969) and no. 180 (1972), G. Orlandi's new work on the *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* (Milano-Varese, 1976), and the text and study of *The Bishop's Synod: The First Synod of St. Patrick* by M. J. Faris et al. (Liverpool, 1976).

Let us turn now to linguistic matters. It has been remarked that, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as Hiberno-Latin.² This is an over-statement. It is true that Hiberno-Latin is essentially medieval Latin; yet, it is influenced by a handful of features of the Old Irish language and possesses other eccentricities, which, if not exclusive to Hiberno-Latin, occur there far more regularly than elsewhere. It was once fashionable, however to attribute almost any peculiarity of Latin syntax, phonetics, or word formation to Irish influence. Many of these eccentricities were later shown to be common to Vulgar and Late Latin in general. It is surprising, for example, that so careful a scholar as Père P. Crojean regarded the nominative absolute as a peculiarly Hibernian construction. In fact, examples of this phenomenon are abundant before the first outbreak of Hiberno-Latin literature.³ The earliest systematic attempt to catalogue the characteristics of Hiberno-Latin, with special reference to the influences of the Irish language, was the doctoral dissertation of Father W. Moet entitled *The Syntax of the Vitas Sanctorum Hiberniae*.⁴ Moet divided his work into chapters on gender and number, case usage, the adjective and adverb, the pronoun, prefix and prepositions, nominal forms of the verb, and syntax of clauses. The work concluded with a summary (Ch. 9) of the influence of Old Irish syntax on the Latinity of the *Vitae*. The data collected in the work are still useful, but the interpretations of syntactical peculiarities - especially those related to the Irish language - must be used with great caution. Like other writers before him, Father Moet tried to use Old Irish to explain certain phenomena that were best explained by Latin itself.

In his excellent introduction to the *Irish Penitentials*, Professor Bieler warned us of some of the difficulties of trying to isolate "characteristic" Hibernian spellings.⁵ As these texts are based on Frankish exemplars, Bieler was right to remark on the difficulty, if not impossibility, of identifying Hibernian, as distinct from Merovingian and common Vulgar Latin spellings. Very few individual spellings can be adduced as an argument that a given text is either Hiberno-Latin or is transmitted through Irish hands. What is crucial to Bieler is the "frequency, if not regularity" of such spellings. Moreover, a few types of spellings are interesting because their irregularities owe nothing to the common Vulgar Latin sound changes. Bengt Elfsædt thinks that certain types of spelling "mistakes," such as *anthlets* and *distinguens*, are hyperurbanisms.⁶ Dag Norberg argues that the terms "hyperurbanism" and "vulgarism" are not applicable to the writings of a people to whom Latin was such an entirely foreign language.⁷ But he seems to carry this argument too far. Granted that the Latin phonetic system must have been quite strange to Irish ears, there is a great deal to suggest that the Irish scholars and students of Latin were very aware of mistakes, not only in written Latin but in the spoken language as well. This awareness is evidenced in the flyings of the *Hesperica Famina* and in the debates over spelling and pronunciation found in the pages of Virgilius Maro.⁸ Furthermore, good arguments have been adduced to show that the Appendix Probi, that famous list of spelling (and pronunciation!) mistakes along with their "corrections," assigned to varying dates in antiquity, was compiled at Bobbio ca. 700, possibly by an Irish redactor.⁹

It is true that the Irish introduced a small number of orthographical peculiarities into their manuscripts that can be explained only by reference to the influence of Irish orthography (and, perhaps, pronunciation) on Latin orthography. These have been catalogued exhaustively by Bengt Elfsædt in the introduction to his edition of *Malactamus*.¹⁰ Elfsædt is to be commended for not exaggerating the Irish influence on orthography (or on morphology and syntax, for that matter). I discussed certain orthographical questions in detail in a paper delivered at a colloquium in Tübingen dealing with the Irish and the continent in the early Middle Ages.¹¹

If there are some peculiarities in Irish spelling and morphology, we must nonetheless not imagine that the Irish imposed their eccentricities on some sort of pure classical Latin which they had

inherited free of any taint of vulgar (i.e., continental) influence. And there is little, if anything, in the Hiberno-Latin works we possess to show that the Irish got their Latin from Britain, and not from the continent.¹² The evidence for "British-Latin" influences in Ireland must be found in the Irish language, not the Latin language preserved in Ireland.¹³ Our best evidence for early eighth-century Irish Latin is to be found in the famous Schaffhausen manuscript of Adomnan's *Vita Columbae*, copied by the Irishman Dorthene. This monument is important because it is one of the very few instances of an approximately dated text of certain Hiberno-Latin origin preserved in an approximately dated manuscript and known to be copied by an Irishman not long after the composition of the text.¹⁴ This document leaves no doubt that some features of Vulgar Latin had permeated Irish Latin as well. These corroborate the phenomena I label as "vulgar" in the *Hesperica Famina*, of which at least the A-Text is preserved in a continental manuscript copied from an Irish exemplar.¹⁵

The lexical area is one of the most interesting for students of Hiberno-Latin. From the earliest period of Irish Latin writings we note the habit of introducing native Irish words with Latin endings. Nímacar of Reims accused his nephew of introducing *Scotticae et alia barbarae* (verba) into his Latin, which leads us to surmise that this was a widespread Irish habit.¹⁶ The practice may have begun in the seventh century with Virgil the Grammarian - about whom we shall say more below - and spread fairly rapidly. Certainly we find examples in Hesperic texts, but the practice is by no means confined to those works. Examples can be found in virtually every genre of Hiberno-Latin literature: grammars, law texts, peregrination literature, and hagiographical materials.¹⁷ I think that the presence of such forms in a text is one of the best indices that the text is of Hiberno-Latin origin.

A handful of neologisms and so-called "ecce neologism" seem to have been coined in Ireland, probably towards the end of the ninth century, and these became fixtures in the vocabulary labelled as "insular." By the middle of the seventh century, these words had made their way to England where they were adopted - at least initially - by Anglo-Latin writers. Many, if not all such words, are properly Hesperic or occur in Virgil the Grammarian, who seems to have been connected to Hesperic compositions. I trace the history of one such word *carasare* (often spelled *crasare*) in the article mentioned below. A. N. Brown, in his excellent article, "Bede, a Hesperic Etymology and

NEW POETRY was traced the history of insular doctores from sixth-century Ireland to Bede. He demonstrates convincingly that the misunderstanding of the word as "flood" rather than as "three-fourths" (late classical meaning) must have begun in Ireland in the sixth century, as it is used in that sense by Columbanus ca. 600. This usage then spread to England, where it is employed in the same sense by Alcuin and his school. The misinterpretation is corrected by Bede, but not before it has influenced the meaning of the native Old English word *oȝor*. The recent study by François Kerlouégan, "Une liste de mots communs à Gildas et à Aldhelm,"¹⁹ confirms the hypothesis that certain trends in word formation and word usage originated in Wales; migrated to Ireland in the sixth century, then spread to Anglo-Saxon England, probably through the Irish missionaries in the seventh century.

Before leaving the area of vocabulary, a word on the purposes of the employment of "Hisperic" and other arcane vocabulary in Hiberno-Latin literature would be in order. Michael Lapidge has rightly warned that "Hisperic" ought to be used strictly to refer to the "exceedingly obscure and almost secretive language of the *Hisperica Famula* themselves, compositions which abound in grecisms and are characterized by a predictable kind of neologism."²⁰ But Hisperic and other rare words, whether neologisms, grecisms or hebraisms, are sprinkled throughout Irish Latin compositions from the sixth to the ninth century. We find them in the hymns - and not just in the *Altus Prosektor* - in the letters of Columbanus, in the *De Locis Sanctis* of Adomnán, in the *Pseudo-Isidorian De Ordine Creaturarum*, and the *Pseudo-Augustinian De Mirabilibus Sacris (or Sanctae) Scripturae*. Even more peculiar is the vocabulary of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, who was almost certainly an Irishman of the seventh century, and that of "Aethicus Ister," almost certainly an Irishman of the eighth.²¹

As I argued a few years ago,²² I think it time that we abandon the "Culture Fungus of Decey" theory advanced by Éoin MacNeill and followed by others. Literary decadence can only set in where there has been a lengthy tradition preserved by schools. I do not think that categories applied to the literary centres of Gaul, North Africa, Spain, and Italy itself in the period ca. 400-600 can be applied accurately to the situation in Ireland, where Latin learning did not come into being much before the middle of the sixth century. But the question arises: why would the Irish, who had barely begun to learn Latin, or at least to use it for literary purposes, have gone to such

lengths, at least in some instances, to make their Latin as obscure as possible? I think the answer is to be found in their own native literary tradition. As D. A. Binchy, with reference to Irish texts, put it so well: "For the fact is that the framers of these ancient verses [sc. of the legal texts] did everything to scare away the outsider. It was a vested interest, the interpretation of these sacred texts, and it was therefore desirable to make them as difficult as possible. There was another reason, too, for the obscurity. To the primitive mind, obscurity is very often synonymous with profundity."²³ There is a great deal to suggest that, from the middle of the sixth century, the Irish adapted their Latinity to the native tradition.²⁴

If it is true that in the area of vocabulary and word formation the Irish were original, even outlandish, in the areas of word arrangement and other stylistic effects, their originality is not so marked. Christine Mohrman in "The Earliest Continental Irish Latin"²⁵ argues that many tendencies found in Irish writers of Columbanus, which constitute our best evidence for early Irish "autochthonic" Latin, "must have been looked upon as a sort of anachronism"²⁶ by a literate Frank of ca. 600. Mohrman views the style of Columbanus' letters as very florid, while regarding their syntax and general structure as a reflection of the "literary language of the fourth and fifth centuries."²⁷

The question of style of Hiberno-Latin writers, apart from problems of vocabulary and idiom, remains to be more fully explored. The pioneering work in this field has been undertaken only in the last decade. François Kerlouégan, in his "Une note stylistique dans la prose latine des pays celtiques,"²⁸ argued that the employment of interlacing word order of the type Adj.1/Adj.2/Subst.1/Subst.2, while relatively common in poetry, was quite rare in prose until its florescence in the ninth century in Wales, Ireland, Brittany, and Devon - in short, Celtic domains or territories under Celtic educational influence. He gathers his statistics from Gildas, Columbanus, Aldhelm, Adomnán, saints' lives from Brittany, and, of course, from the *Hisperica Famula*, which occupies an important position in this development. Michael Winterbottom argued against Kerlouégan's position in two articles. In "A 'Celtic' Hyperbaton?"²⁹ Winterbottom takes the case for a much wider diffusion of the phenomenon in late Latin prose than granted by Kerlouégan; moreover, according to Winterbottom, not all of Kerlouégan's examples are valid. In "Aldhelm's Prose Style and the

origins.³¹ Winterbottom makes some additional points. Apart from hyperbaton, which is well developed elsewhere, the writings of Aldhelm owe nothing to Celtic models for style (Winterbottom is not concerned with vocabulary); there is much to show that the shape of the Aldhelmian sentence is derived from continental models. On the other hand, Winterbottom acknowledges that the employment of hyperbaton around a central verb, in imitation of the "golden line" of classical poetry, was "at home" in Ireland.³¹

In his "Columbanus and Gildas,"³² Winterbottom shows the debt of Columbanus to Gildas (whom Columbanus knew and cited) in the areas of metaphor, word order, alliteration, and sentence construction. Here Winterbottom seems readier to concede - albeit cautiously - that there was some stylistic continuity in matters of word order and alliteration from Gildas to Columbanus to Aldhelm. (Curiously, Winterbottom does not raise the question of whether Aldhelm could have known the letters of Columbanus.) With the exception of a few passages in Columbanus and the preface of Muirchu's life of Patrick, Winterbottom sees little influence of the "rambling periods of Gildas" on Irish writers of the seventh century;³³ elsewhere, Winterbottom refers to Ireland as "home of an unforced rhetoric and of grammatical correctness."³⁴

It is certainly true that some more detailed studies of the style of individual Hiberno-Latin writers be made. We need far more studies along the lines of Winterbottom's work on Aldhelm: studies containing discussion of sentence construction, word order, prose rhythms, alliteration, assonance, rhyme, and other rhetorical devices of both sound and sense. We still lack such a study even for Columbanus. Winterbottom's article is far too brief, Mohrman's work too general, while J. W. Omit's *Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Younger (Columbanus)*³⁵ concerns itself with the interpretation of individual words and the solving of textual cruxes rather than with style in the broader sense.

At this point I think it would be useful to discuss those features of Hiberno-Latin that might be termed "literary" rather than linguistic or stylistic. I refer to those features in the biblical commentaries noted by R. E. McNally and Bernhard Bischoff. Bischoff, in his famous article "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter,"³⁶ lists as *irische Symptome*: the use of *Beloge* for "collection" or "selections"; the favouring of *Paucus* de in a title (e.g., the so-called *Arx Clementis* had the title *Paucus* de

grammatica); fondness for the "triad"³⁷ *locus, tempus, persona*; phrases such as *hic est ordo*; and perhaps the most characteristic of all, the answering of a question with the phrase *quid dubium*, or more especially *non difficile*, reflecting the Irish *ní anso*, a phrase frequently in the law tracts.

Another Irish feature noted by Bischoff and further developed by Father Robert B. McNally is the allusion to the three sacred languages: Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. McNally, in his article "The 'Tree Linguae Sacrae' in Early Bible Exegesis,"³⁸ makes a collection of these curiosities and explains their use. He asserts: "Where this question of the three languages is raised in a Bible commentary of unknown origin, one can certainly conclude to the influence of the Irish tradition."³⁹ As Bischoff, McNally, and others have noted: the use of real or bogus Hebrew and Greek, in addition to Latin, is not confined to exegetical works. We find examples in several grammatical treatises, including Virgilius Maro.⁴⁰ The tendency apparently became so widespread that it became a topic for parody by a certain "Sergillus," who called himself "discipulus Virgili."⁴¹ Elsewhere we find examples in the letters of Columbanus,⁴² in the Vita Columbae of Adomnan,⁴³ and in the Pseudo-Isoidorian *Liber de summis*, which McNally attributes to the circle of Virgil of Salzburg.⁴⁴ Bischoff notes Bede's negative reaction to this curious custom in his *Hexameron*⁴⁵ - a reaction that might be instructively compared to that writer's criticism of the Irish use of *doctrina*.

Whether we can be certain that any one of these features in itself is sure evidence of Irish authorship or whether we must rely on a combination of such features remains a point of contention. Martin McNamara's article, "A Plea for Hiberno-Latin Biblical Studies,"⁴⁶ argues for the second method: "What leads one from a mere surmise on the possibility of Irish authorship to probability or even certainty is the combination in a single work of several of these symptoms. Then there are indications besides, as for example the presence of Irish peculiarities in the text, peculiarities in the abbreviation of words, of spelling, etc. Putting all these together we can form strong arguments for Irish authorship."⁴⁷ Perhaps the most deeply sceptical of the Bischoff-McNally method of establishing the Irish origin of a text was Edmund Coccis. In his "La culture irlandaise préromantique: Miracolo a lato!"⁴⁸ he wrote of McNally's arguments for the Irish origin of a commentary on the Catholic Epistles: "He takes *mondo vime*

detec irlandesi perché riscontrabile in altri commentari biblici che, a loro volta, sono messi in relazione con l'Irlanda solo per dubbie ricostruzioni ipotetiche.⁴⁹

Although I do not accept the radical scepticism of Corcio, I am at times a little uneasy about the assumption that the presence in a text of two or three of the features listed by Bischoff constitutes proof of Irish origin. The vast majority of the manuscripts containing every sort of Hiberno-Latin literature are continental. We know that there were non-Irish in Irish monastic centres as well as Irish in non-Irish centres. Even granting that most so-called "Irish symptoms" originated in Ireland or in some Irish milieu, there was nothing to prevent the spread of literary fads outside Irish circles, even allowing for the censure and parody of such fads by Bede and by non-Irishmen on the continent in the time of Charlemagne. Without the presence of philological evidence, such as that discussed above, we would be wiser to refer to such works as "exhibiting Irish influence" rather than "Irish."

In connection with the *tres linguae sacrae*, a word or two on the question of the Irish knowledge of Greek and Hebrew would be appropriate. Professor Bischoff in "Wendepunkte" and more especially in his "Das griechische Element in der abendländischen Bildung des Mittelalters"⁵⁰ has shown that most of the Greek known to the Irish was derived from glossaries, and, in not a small number of cases was purely fictitious. Bischoff rightly distinguishes between a knowledge of a language acquired from glossaries alone and that derived from a proper grammatical study. That the Irish studied the Greek classics in Ireland during the period 550-800 is no longer seriously entertained. Still a few aigles remain regarding a wholly negative picture. The textual evidence for a brighter view is highly tentative, but there are a few bits that show that the Irish possessed at least a superficial knowledge of the Greek language in the seventh and eighth centuries.⁵¹ There is some evidence that the Irish knew and used the Greek bible before the Carolingian period.⁵² By the ninth century, the evidence for the Irish knowledge of Greek is abundant. John Contreni has added greatly to our knowledge of Hiberno-Greek learning in his work *The Cathedral School of Laon from 880-930: its Manuscripts and Masters*.⁵³ It is difficult to imagine, in the light of such demonstrated learning, that the Irish in Ireland had no access to Greek grammars in the formative period. As to the situation of Hebrew, my own research on Virgilius Marcus Grammaticus confirms the now generally

accepted notion that the Irish knowledge of Hebrew was restricted virtually to lists of words derived from Jerome and Isidore, plus what the fecund imaginations of the Irish scholars could contrive. For the knowledge of Hebrew in the early Middle Ages, including Ireland, we now have the excellent study by Matthias Thiel: *Grundrissen und Gestalt der Hebräischkenntnisse des frühen Mittelalters*.⁵⁴

In the past twenty years or so, some radical shifts have taken place in matters such as the dating and authenticity of a considerable amount of Hiberno-Latin literature. This in turn had led to a re-evaluation of the nature and quality of that literature and the culture that produced it. What I term the older view - a view that still has many adherents - lays stress on the "classical quality" of that literature: purity of style coupled with a knowledge of at least the major Latin works of classical antiquity. By this account, Ireland is reckoned as the *insula sanctorum doctorumque* at a time when the rest of Europe languished in barbarism.⁵⁵ Moreover, such features of style as long, contorted sentences and Hispanic vocabulary were viewed as aberrations: the florid and jargon of the "decadent" literature derived from southwestern British culture of the sixth century. Generally speaking, the past twenty years have produced a near reversal of that evaluation. Ireland's knowledge of the Latin classics as well as her ability to produce good metrical poetry during the formative period has been brought into serious question. On the other hand, there is now much evidence to show that Ireland played a much greater role than previously thought in the development of arcane vocabulary and stylistic monstrosities such as the *scanderraticae formosae*.

The cornerstones of the older orthodoxy was the argument that Columbanus or Columba the Younger, who was alleged to have been born before the middle of the sixth century and educated at Bangor, wrote a number of metrical poems in which he quotes or paraphrases Vergil, Horace, Ovid, and a number of the later Christian poets; further, that his letters also reflect classical erudition. Challenges to the argument were made by Gustav Hertel⁵⁶ in the nineteenth century, and more recently by Mario Spanio.⁵⁷ Hertel denied the authenticity of the poems, while Spanio argued that Columbanus' classical learning was acquired on the continent. In 1971, J. U. Smit published his dissertation, *Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Monach* (Columbanus).⁵⁸ Smit attacked the question on two former fronts, he attempted to show that the classical reminiscences in Columbanus'

letters could either be traced to late sources, such as Jerome, or were in fact *loci communes*. Secondly, he expanded Hertel's arguments against the authenticity of the poems. In the first assault he was highly successful, in the second, much less so.

Just recently, a much more effective onslaught against the authenticity of the metrical poems was launched by Michael Lapidge in his "The Authorship of the Adonic Verses 'Ad Fidolium' Attributed to Columbanus."⁵⁹ This paper makes an entirely new case against Columbanus of Bobbio's authorship of "Ad Fidolium," "Ad Sethum," and "Ad Hunsaldum" and argues that they were written between the late eighth and early ninth centuries by a Columbanus who was the abbot of St. Trond and the author of the *Planctus* on the death of Charlemagne. Lapidge discards the arguments of Hertel and Smit and offers totally fresh ones based upon the form of the "Ad Fidolium," the manuscript tradition, the sources (especially the classical ones), and the possible identities of the recipients of the three poems. His most striking discovery centres on the name *Fidolius*, which occurs in a confraternity list from St. Peter's in Salzburg in the familia of the Irish bishop Virgil (767-784). According to Lapidge, the name is "extremely rare and may well be unique."⁶⁰ The evidence is enhanced by the fact that the earliest manuscript of the "Ad Fidolium" was copied in the late eighth century, probably before ca. 790.⁶¹ Whether the learned world will accept the case as closed is not certain. But those who would re-instate Columbanus of Bobbio as the author of the metrical poems just named will now have to deal with the new arguments and new evidence raised by Lapidge.

Another blow by B. Coccia,⁶² followed again by Lapidge, was aimed at the reputation of the Irish as composers of metrical poetry in the seventh century. At stake is the allegation that Callianus, abbot of Ferrona Scottorum and a correspondent of Aldhelm's towards the end of the seventh century, penned a handful of hexameters on the dedication of an oratory to St. Patrick. Coccia was certainly right to call our attention to the prefacing lines: "Haec modo Callianus venerandi nominis abbas/suavis dactylicis describi carmina versu." He queries whether the words *suavis describi* can be taken as sure proof of authorship. Lapidge, in his "Some Remnants of Bede's lost *Liber Epigramatum*,"⁶³ challenges Traube's assumption that the author of the lines was identical with Aldhelm's correspondent. Lapidge notes, however, that internal evidence shows the author to have been Irish and that the earliest

manuscript of the lines dates from the eighth century.

Coccia is more successful in loosening the support for the notion that the Irish composed metrical verses in the seventh century in querying Manitius' suggestion that the "Versus Columani Scoti de Alphabeto" (a series of rather witty alphabet letter name riddles) were composed in that century.⁶⁴ Manitius offers no stronger evidence than some slight acquaintance with Greek and Hebrew alphabet lore expressed in the poem (typical of seventh-century Irish activity, but by no means confined to it) and the mention of the name of Pope Gregory the Great; Manitius also alleges that the Anglo-Saxon Eusebius relied on the poem for his own alphabetical riddles - an allegation that might warrant further investigation. In short, there is no convincing reason for assigning the poem to the seventh century rather than to the eighth or even the early ninth.

My arguments regarding the date and locale of the *Hesperica Famula*⁶⁵ and more recently, those advocating that Virgil the Grammarian was a seventh-century Irishman, not a fifth or sixth-century Gaul,⁶⁶ give us a different picture of the formative period, at least for the seventh century. If Virgil was in any way typical of mid-seventh-century Hiberno-Latin culture - and I fear that he may have been - then we must conclude, for lack of evidence to the contrary, that the preservation of classical culture was not an Irish occupation at that time. Virgil's own classical education was impoverished. In his section on metre in the *Epitomes*, Virgil was metrical terminology, but the examples he employs reveal that Virgil knew nothing of metrical practice. His sources do not appear to go beyond the bible, Jerome, Isidore, and an assortment of grammarians. He displays, however, a fondness for pseudo-learning that exceeds that of *Hesperica Famula*: abstruse vocabulary, use of Greek, Hebrew, Irish, and possibly even Germanic words as well as hybrids, highly fanciful stylizations, puns and word-play, alphabet lore, and various kinds of cryptography. If Virgil's writings were not intended as a "send-up" - and I am not completely convinced that they were - then they must represent an attempt to graft the skin of Irish *filidecht* such as we find in the Auraicept na n'Éces onto the flesh of Latin culture. After 700 or thereabouts, our evidence for this Hiberno-Latin culture in Ireland proper attenuates, as the vernacular begins to assume more of the values once reserved for Latin.⁶⁷ It is in the vernacular literature, however, that we find the best evidence for the early Irish alphabet.

tradition, although most of the material crops up after the high point of Irish activity on the continent, i.e., the late ninth century. M. B. Stanford has studied this interesting area in two works *Ireland and the Classical Tradition*,⁶⁸ and in greater detail for the early medieval period in "Towards a History of Classical Influences in Ireland."⁶⁹

Hiberno-Latin literature in the eighth century seems to have been heavily concentrated on the production of grammars,⁷⁰ and on exegetical and hagiographical materials.⁷¹ An important exception is, possibly, the fascinating composition known as the *Cosmographia*, written by a self-styled Hieronymus Presbyter, who professed to present a Latin epitome of the writings of a Greek scientist and traveller named Aethicus Ister ("the Iatrin"). The language, the sources, and the contents of his treatise rule out the possibility that the work was composed in the fifth century, much less by Jerome himself. Clearly the work belongs to the corpus of pseudonymous literature of the early Middle Ages. Professor Hains Löwe was the first to advance the argument that the work was not only by an Irishman, but by the notorious opponent of St. Boniface, Bishop Virgilius of Salzburg. The case was first presented in "Ein literarischer Wideracher des Bonifatius: Virgilius von Salzburg und die Kosmographie des Aethicus Ister."⁷² Löwe's main arguments for the Irish origin of Aethicus are: knowledge and use of *Hesperica Famina*; stylistic influences of Virgilius Maro, knowledge of the *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*, a word-play involving an Irish etymology, and another concealed in the author's pseudonym Aethicus, i.e., the name refers to *Aethica insula ortu etha*. Löwe's argument for the date and authorship of the work were countered by Neartje Drask,⁷³ Franz Brunnhölzl,⁷⁴ and by Kurt Milkowitz in the second volume of his *Zur Kosmographie des Aethicus*,⁷⁵ while the alleged connection of Virgil of Salzburg to Iona was given scant support by Pärre Grosjean in his "Virgile de Salzburg en Irlande."⁷⁶ Professor Löwe has responded to these objections and introduced some new arguments in his "Salzburg als Zentrum literarischen Schaffens im 8. Jahrhundert."⁷⁷ A new text of this work is badly needed,⁷⁸ and I propose to undertake the task once other pressing projects are completed.

This brings us to work in progress. It would appear that the editing of Hiberno-Latin grammars is at the moment receiving the closest attention. Professor Bischoff has written me that his work on the edition of *Chrysostomus ad Cyprianum*, in collaboration with

B. Taeger, is nearing completion. Bengt Lfstedt informs me that his edition of a Donatus commentary found in Abrosiana L.22 sup. is ready in typescript. He is also planning an edition of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus for the Teubner series.⁷⁹ I understand that editions of Hiberno-Latin grammars prepared by his students are to appear in the *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*.⁸⁰ I have prepared an edition of the Hiberno-Latin grammatical miscellany in Amiens 426 (fols. 1-29), which I hope to publish presently.⁸¹

In December, 1978, I received the good news that Professor Bieler's *The Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh* were at the first proof stage and so I do not think it will be very long before we have good new editions of Tírechán and Máircé. This collection will appear in the *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae*.⁸² I do not have an up-to-date report on the status of Dom McGinty's new edition of the *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*, but I know that we shall all welcome its appearance. Finally, I am able to report that my second volume of *Hesperica Famina* will soon be ready for press.

I was happy to learn that the Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources is now definitely underway. The project is being sponsored and financed by the Royal Irish Academy. As of November, 1978, the following texts were computerized: *Opera Petrici Episcopi Dublinensis*, *Penitentialia Vinniani*, *Myrmis Secundini*, *Hesperica Famina*, *The A-Text*, two volumes of the *Periphyseon*, the *Vita Matris Sabactae*, *Brigidee*, the *Canones Hibernenses*, *Annales Cambriae*, the metrical *Vita S. Senani*, the *Navigatio S. Brendani*, and various Hiberno-Latin poems. I am grateful to Miss Maure Walsh of the Irish Academy project for this information.

I think we can now safely say that Hiberno-Latin has come of age. Many of the major monuments in this area are now in good critical editions, or will be shortly. The commitment to the Hiberno-Latin, or more broadly Celtic, dictionary project should assist not only in the unravelling of the mysteries of arcane words, but also contribute to the establishment of reliable word-histories with all that that entails for cultural history. What remains to be done? The answer is simple: much. We will require editions of many of the exegetical works listed by Bischoff in "Wendepunkte." Father McNamara's article⁸⁴ is very useful in this regard, though a few editions have been completed or undertaken since the appearance of that piece. As I noted above, individual stylistic and lexical studies are wanted for even the most major works

of Hiberno-Latin literature. Bibliographical aids and literary guides are also needed. We now possess a sufficient number of critical editions and literary-historical studies to justify, at the very least, an introduction to the history of Hiberno-Latin literature of the same scope as W. F. Bolton's *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature*. For the moment, we are still dependent upon Esposito's scattered papers,⁸⁵ Coccia's survey, Bieler's *Ireland, Harbingers of the Middle Ages*,⁸⁶ and of course, J. F. Kenney's *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, which is now badly in need of up-dating and revision. It goes without saying that attention to this last-named task (perhaps by a team?) would receive universal gratitude.

We still need to know much more about individual areas. The question of what was quintessentially Irish in the syllabic and rhythmical verse of the sixth and seventh centuries, for example, remains unanswered. And although at the moment the evidence looks scanty, we nevertheless need a study of the Irish practice of metrical verse composition in the formative period.⁸⁷ The interpenetration of the Latin and Celtic traditions, especially with respect to Irish translations and adaptations of classical literature, should continue to claim our attention. Finally a desideratum addressed to historians of culture and education: as Pierre Miché pointed out in *Éducation et culture dans l'occident barbare*,⁸⁸ a critical history of the schools of Ireland remains to be written.⁸⁹

NOTES

¹ J. F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical*: (rev. L. Bieler, New York, 1966; rev. Dublin, 1979), pp. 82-83.

² M. Esposito, "On the New Edition of the Opera Sancti Columbanii," *C & M* 21 (1960): 184-201, esp. 196-97.

³ A detailed and critical survey of earlier attempts to define and characterize Hiberno-Latin is given by S. Löfstedt, *Der hiberno-lateinische Grammatiker Malsachanus* (Uppsala, 1965), pp. 81-86.

⁴ W. Moat, *The Syntax of the Vitas Sanctorum Hiberniae*, Washington D. C., 1946.

⁵ Bieler, ed., *The Irish Penitentials* (Dublin, 1963), pp. 27-47; esp. pp. 28-29.

⁶ Löfstedt, *Malsachanus*, pp. 154-55.

⁷ "Latin scolaire et latin vivant," *ALMA* (Bulletin du Cange) 40 (1975-76): 51-63; esp. 58-61.

⁸ See my edition, pp. 73-74; J. Huguenot, *Virgili Maronis Grammatici Opera* (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 114-15, 118, 120, 137, 151. See n. 79, below.

⁹ See C. A. Robson, "L'Appendix Probi et la philologie latine," *Revue Noyon* 69 (1961): 37-34.

¹⁰ Löfstedt, *Malsachanus*, pp. 86-107.

¹¹ "Sprachliche Eigentümlichkeiten in den hibernolateinischen Texten des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts," to be published in the proceedings of the Nürtingen colloquium: "Die Iran und Europa im früheren Mittelalter," under the editorship of Haina Löwe (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981).

¹² See Löfstedt, *Malsachanus*, pp. 150-54.

¹³ It cannot be emphasised too strongly that the known Latin documents emanating from Ireland and its cultural satellites, including the Latin writings of Saint Patrick, give no support to the influence of "British Latin" upon the written Latin of Ireland. For the main outlines and some refinements of the theory of the influence of "British Latin" on Irish, see K. Jackson, *Language and Society in Early Britain* (Edinburgh, 1933), pp. 122-48.

little to the pre-Carolingian picture.

⁵² See W. Berschin, "Abendland und Byzanz," *Reallexikon der Byzantinistik* (Amsterdam, 1971), 1:254. See now Edouard Jeuneanu's judicious remarks in "Jean Scot Erigène et le Grec," *ALMA* 41 (1979), 5-50.

⁵³ Cited above, n. 16.

⁵⁴ In the *Biblioteca degli Studi Medievali*, vol. 4 (Spoleto, 1973).

⁵⁵ For an account of these views, see Coccia's survey, *passim*. See also my "Classical and Secular Learning Among the Irish before the Carolingian Renaissance," *Florilegium* 3 (1982): forthcoming.

⁵⁶ "Ueber das heiligen Columbas Leben und Schriften, besonders über seine Klosterregel," *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* 45 (1875): 396-454.

⁵⁷ Cited above, n. 2.

⁵⁸ Cited above, n. 35.

⁵⁹ *SN* 18.2 (1977): 249-314.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

⁶¹ On the date of Dies B. Sept 66, see Bischoff, *Sammelhandschrift* Dies. B. Sept 66: *Grammatici Latini et Catalogus Librorum* (Graz, 1973), pp. 21-23; also Lapidge's comments in "Authorship," pp. 286-88.

⁶² Coccia, pp. 318-20.

⁶³ *BNR* 90, no. 357 (Oct. 1975): 798-820.

⁶⁴ Coccia, pp. 320-22.

⁶⁵ Warren, *Hispanica Fama*, pp. 32-39.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, "Some New Light," pp. 42-68.

⁶⁷ T. J. Brown, "An Historical Introduction to the Use of Classical Latin Authors in the British Isles from the Fifth to the Eleventh Century," *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1975), pp. 249-50.

⁶⁸ Totowa, New Jersey, 1976.

⁶⁹ *PRIA*, 70, C, 3 (1970): 13-91. For recent work on an Irish adaptation of a classical tale, see B. O'hodha, "The Irish Version of Statius' *Achilleid*," *PRIA* 79, C, 4 (1979): 83-137.

⁷⁰ See Löffstedt, *Malacthanus*, esp. chs. 1-3 and ch. 6, pp. 55-61 and 71-73. Some revisions of Löffstedt's datings of grammarians will be put forward in V. Law's *The Insular Latin Grammarians*, Woodbridge, forthcoming.

⁷¹ See the papers in the collection edited by McNamara, cited above, n. 46 and the September 1979 issue of *Thought*, which contains essays by Bischoff, Kelly, McNamara, and Glenn Olsen.

⁷² *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse*, 1951, no. 111 (appeared, 1952), pp. 898-988.

⁷³ *Dancwart opstellen aangeboden aan D. Th. Ruklaar* (Groningen, 1959), pp. 33-42.

⁷⁴ *Festschrift für Max Spindler zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. D. Albrecht et al. (Munich, 1969), pp. 75-89.

⁷⁵ Frankfurt, 1973.

⁷⁶ *AB* 78 (1960): 92-123.

⁷⁷ *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde*, Band 115 (1975): 39-143.

⁷⁸ On the need for a new edition, see Wesley Stevens' review of Hilkwits's *Sur Cosmographie des Aethiopes in Speculum* 51 (1976): 752-55.

⁷⁹ Since the reading of this paper, a new edition of Virgilius Maro has appeared: G. Polara and L. Caruso, ed. and trans., *Virgilius Maro grammatico, Epitome ed Epistolae* (Naples, 1979). See now my review, *SN*, 3rd ser., 21.2 (1980): 757-61.

⁸⁰ Anne Puckett has made a new edition of Clement's grammar and John Chittenden, an editio princeps of Donatus Ortigraphus (i.e. Artigraphus).

⁸¹ A portion of this work was presented at the Fifth International Celtic Congress, Galway, July 6-13, 1979.

⁸² Since this paper was read Professor Rialler's work has appeared bearing the date 1979.

⁸³ In the *Studies and Texts Series* of the Press of the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto.

⁸⁴ Cited above, p. 60. See also the "Bibliography on Iberian-Latin Biblical Texts" by Joseph Kelly in McNamara, ed., *Biblical Studies*, cited above, n. 36.

⁸⁵ The papers of Hespinet relevant to Iberian-Latin are handily listed in the bibliography of Stanford's "A History of Classical Influences," cited above, n. 49.

⁸⁶ Reprinted with corrections, London, 1966.

⁸⁷ The metrical practices of the ninth-century Iberian-Latin poet Donatus are catalogued by D. W. Kiame, "Dixta Metrica Sanctus Brigidus: a Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary and Indices," *PRIA* 77, C, 3 (1977): 71-72.

⁸⁸ See the English translation by J. J. Contreni, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West* (Columbia, South Carolina, 1976), p. 311, n 18.

⁸⁹ Unfortunately, the new work of Fergal McGrath, S. J., *Education in Ancient and Medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1979), though useful in a number of respects, does not fulfil this desideratum.

JOHN SCOTTUS, MARTIN HIBERNICENSIS, THE LIBERAL ARTS, AND TEACHING

John J. Contreni

Purdue University

The Irishmen who came to the continent in the ninth century left a rich record of teaching behind them. One Irishman, by way of exception, felt obligated to point out that he was not skilled in grammar.¹ Most were, however, and have left their glosses and commentaries as witnesses to their role as teachers in the Carolingian realm.² Two of these masters offer us a particularly good glimpse of the activities and significance of Irish teachers around the middle of the ninth century. The first, John Scottus, called Erigena, is of course one of the most prominent Irish masters of the early Middle Ages.³ His renown centres on his accomplishments as a philosophic thinker, as a translator from Greek, and as an exegete. Only recently have modern scholars begun to illuminate John's role as a teacher.⁴ The second Irish master whose teaching career I wish to examine is Martin Hibernensis (819-875), a contemporary of John who taught in the cathedral school of Laon. I wrote quite extensively of Martin in my book on the cathedral school of Laon and will not repeat that discussion here except in the most general outline.⁵ Rather, I want to use this opportunity to look more closely at Martin's teaching by presenting and examining an interesting unpublished text he used in introducing his students to the liberal arts.

Although John and Martin were masters of quite different natures, their interest in the liberal arts and their notions about the value of learning unite them and afford me a splendid opportunity to learn how and what two Irish masters taught their students.

John was a teacher before his career broadened to include translation and philosophical speculation. It was his teaching in the palace that first brought him to the attention of Carolingian prelates interested in marshalling theological support against the ideas of

codex of Orbaïs.⁶ John entered the world of theological controversy after he had gained a reputation as a commentator on the liberal arts. We have no idea how long John commented on the *De Nuptiis* of Martianus Capella, but I feel certain that it was not simply a passing phase in his career. Several versions of the commentary circulated. It was continually being reworked.⁷ John was most concerned to obtain a faithful text of Martianus upon which to comment and worked with an Abbot Winibertus to that end.⁸

The explication of Martianus Capella's allegory of the arts forced John to consider such wide-ranging problems as the division of knowledge, the place of the arts in a Christian education, and the nature of man and the universe. Comment on a work as rich and as obscure as the *De Nuptiis* necessitated familiarity with Greek, mythology, classical literature, and the arts themselves. The requisite training inevitably affected a master's approach to other problems, however, where the intrusion of methods and materials gained in the explication of Martianus Capella were questioned by some. The critique that Prudentius of Troyes made of John's *De Praedestinatione* centred exactly on that point.⁹ Prudentius' view was only one. The study of the arts in Christian culture was officially sanctioned and encouraged on the Continent in the *Epistola de Litteris Colendiis*, a document which might be called the manifesto of the Carolingian renaissance.¹⁰ Here, Alcuin argued that the proper understanding of Christian wisdom depended upon proper understanding of a written text, the Scriptures. In order to comprehend the profundity of this text, one must be trained in the arts, especially that of grammar. What he was saying, reduced to its simplest terms, is that the search for spiritual wisdom presupposes intellectual training. In another place, Alcuin employed a famous image which enjoyed great success in ninth-century poetry and art.¹¹ He compared Christian wisdom to a temple supported by seven columns. The columns were the seven liberal arts without which, of course, the temple could not stand. For Alcuin, the arts were not simply a propaedeutic, but an essential element of Christian learning.

In his commentary on the *De Nuptiis*, John completed the Christianization of the arts begun by Alcuin, but along different lines. John's striking metaphysical formulations were studied by Gerard Mathon in his paper at the 1967 international philosophical conference at Montreal.¹² For John, learning was not only an aid towards the achievement of Christian wisdom, but a means of salvation itself: "Nemo intrat in

relum nisi per philosophiam."¹³ In another place he equated true wisdom with religion: "Veram esse philosophiam veram religionem, conversimque religionem esse veram philosophiam."¹⁴ In pursuing the study of the arts, in particular, one progresses in perfection since the arts are innate in man. Knowledge of them has been clouded by the fall. Their recovery by study helps to restore man to his pristine state.

John shared these views with other ninth-century masters. Martin Mitherniensis seems, for example, to complement John in his comments on Origen's analysis of the divine source of the arts.¹⁵ The immanence of the arts is clearly formulated by an anonymous ninth-century commentator on the *De Nuptiis*.¹⁶ A propos of Martianus Capella's discussion of accidents in Book 4, John used the example of Cicero's possession of the art of rhetoric and concluded that

Sed quia unaqueque ars, quavis propriam quandam naturam suam habeat, in se fieri non potest sed in aliquo subiecto substantia necesse est ut constatat, non est, et ad semet ipsam redire dum alio aliquo continetur. Itaque necesse est ut aliter atque melius intellegamus. Omnis igitur naturalis ars in humana natura posita et concreta est. Inde conficitur ut omnes homines habeant naturaliter naturales artes, sed quia poena peccati primi hominis in animabus hominum et in quasdam profundam ignorantiam devolvuntur, nihil aliud agimus discendo nisi easdem artes quae in profundo memoriae repositae sunt in praesentiam intelligentiam revocamus, et cum aliis occupamus curis, nihil aliud agimus artes negligendo nisi ipsas artes iterum dimittere ut redeant ad id a quo revocatae sunt.¹⁷

The neoplatonic theory of recollection that is at the heart of this comment complements John's notion on the immanence of the arts and Martin's belief in the God-given nature of the arts. The important point to be grasped in these texts is the tremendous emphasis given to the arts and to the process of education as a whole. The arts were not merely a convenient schema of knowledge nor simply an important element of Christian wisdom in Alcuin's sense. They have not been created by man, but are a constituent part of his nature. No longer simply a tool, the arts are man's link with the Divine, their cultivation a means to salvation.

It would be difficult to over-estimate the significance of this development. The new emphasis on the place of the arts in Christian education must be seen as one of the chief factors animating the ninth century's intense interest in the arts and the immense labour involved in commenting upon Martianus Capella's work. Remigius of Auxerre, who summed up and transmitted to a wider audience the work of his predecessors, owed his thoughts on the arts to the anonymous commentator on Martianus Capella and to John Scottus.¹⁸

John's theories about the arts and learning were not confined to the early work on Marciianus Capella. The theme occurs at least twice more in the commentary on the *Celestial Hierarchy* and in the *Periphyseon*. In a comment on Pseudo-Dionysius' work, John followed his author in preferring "the seven disciplines which the philosophers call liberal"; the sacred disciplines. They are avenues to the knowledge of things. John, however, went beyond the implications of Pseudo-Dionysius when he offered his own "notione interpretatione." Just as the waters from various sources come together and flow in the bed of one stream, so too are the arts united in the contemplation of Christ, "summus fons totius sapientie." In a concluding aphorism reminiscent of the passages which attracted Machon's attention, John stated confidently, "Nulla enim sacra scriptura est que regulis liberalium careat disciplinarum."¹⁹ He made this same point earlier in the eighteenth chapter of his treatise on predestination, where he imputed his opponent's failure to understand the holy fathers to ignorance of the liberal arts.²⁰

In Book 5 of the *Periphyseon*, John was concerned with explaining the principle that all things return to their sources: "Finis enim totius motus est principium sui."²¹ Many examples from the sensible world illustrated his point. The activities of the sun, the moon, the other planets, the air, the ocean, the ebb and flow of the tides, and the cycles of vegetative life "quibus in foetus, flores, folia, fructus erumpunt" were all called into play. But the process of return is not limited to the sensible world. It includes also those things which are considered by the mind alone such as "those disciplines which the philosophers call liberal." Eriugena specifically elaborated by showing how dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy all return to their own particular principles. Arithmetic begins with the monad, progresses through various species of numbers, to return to the monad themselves. Geometry begins with the point, considers planes, solids, angles, depth, surface, longitude, and latitude, which all can be reduced to the point. The *Alumne* of the *Periphyseon* saw the wisdom of the Nutritor's explication, but confessed that he could not see why grammar and rhetoric were excluded. John's reply is interesting. Grammar and rhetoric, first of all, are divisions of dialectic. Secondly, those two arts do not concern the natural order, but rather the rules of the human voice which are determined not by nature, but by custom. If that is so, the *Alumne* rejoined, why are they counted among the arts if they are not natural but the products of human

machinations? Precisely because, the Nutritor replied, they are joined to dialectic, the mother of the arts, and flow from it like the branches of a river.

This very interesting discussion in the *Periphyseon* introduces a second element into John's teaching. Clearly, not all the arts were created equal. Where did he get his schema? Although we speak of the traditional liberal arts consisting of the trivium and the quadrivium, it is clear that the arts were counted and ordered in a variety of ways in the early Middle Ages. Isidore of Seville, for example, described several different arrangements.²² In his *De Differentiis Verborum* he presented *sapientia* under these headings: Physics, Logic, and Ethics. Physics includes the seven disciplines of arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy, astrology, mechanics, and medicine. Logic embraces dialectic and rhetoric, while Ethics includes the four principal virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance.²³ Grammar is nowhere mentioned. This division seems to have been particularly favored by Irish masters. While John's observation that the arts return to their principles seems to reflect his own neoplatonism, his view of grammar and rhetoric as divisions of logic resembles the Hiberno-Latin versions of Isidore's *Differentiae* as presented, for example, by Martin Hiberniensis for whom logic is said to consist of rhetoric and dialectic to which grammar "adheres."²⁴

At the conclusion of his investigation of early medieval arrangements of the arts, Manuel G. Diaz y Diaz described such schemas as "un detail étroit, une notice qui se transmet d'un auteur à un autre, qu'un auteur peut continuer ou modifier d'après ses propres points de vue, sans correspondance pourtant dans la vie réelle de l'enseignement."²⁵ In the case of John Scattus in the ninth century, this judgment seems unduly pessimistic. John did not simply draw up lists of the arts, but discussed them and their significance in the course of major works: the commentary on the *De Mystica*, the *Expositiones* on the *Celestial Hierarchy*, and the *Periphyseon*. In addition, I have mentioned that there seems to be some connection between John's division of the arts and that of Martin Hiberniensis, who certainly did teach from the manuscript (Laon 446) that preserves his thoughts on the subject. We also know, finally, that John's interpretation passed into the work of Ramigius of Auxerre, whose commentary on Marciianus Capella was the most successful produced in the Middle Ages. A search of the commentaries of ninth and tenth-century masters might turn up additional schemas of

John's theories. The opening lines of an eloquent poem written by an anonymous ninth-century master who knew John's work seems to be one indication of the currency of John's theories. The master opened his poem in which he lamented his early attachment to Marcellianus Capella with the statement, "In the first flower of my life, I was clever in the arts/by which the highest, one God is worshipped."²⁶

This anonymous master affords a convenient transition to the second portion of my remarks on John's teaching career. What precisely is the evidence for the transmission of his teaching to his own generation? The author of the poem whose opening lines I have just cited apparently knew John since he copied two Erigenian distichs of a rather light nature onto the flyleaf of his Vergil manuscript. He also prefaced a translation of a Byzantine hymn to the Virgin in the same manuscript with several verses from John's poem on the Incarnation.²⁷ This kind of evidence, admittedly, is not entirely satisfying. However, the fact is that only two of John's students are named for us. One, Bishop Elias of Angoulême (861-875), an Irishman, is mentioned in a tenth-century source of questionable reliability.²⁸ Reference to the second disciple is more certain. The authors of the *Deeds of the bishops of Auxerre* recorded that their Bishop Michald (879-887) studied at the feet of John Scottus, whose rays of wisdom diffused throughout Gaul. Michald was proficient in divine and human learning. His biographers, however, noted that his first instruction under John's direction was in the liberal arts.²⁹

This master's class roll can be lengthened by a consideration of masters whose links to John's teaching are not as directly expressed. Almann of Hautvillers, Eubald of Saint-Amand, Heiric of Auxerre, Sedulius Scottus, and Martin Riberniensis are the most prominent masters who were influenced by John's teaching during his lifetime.

Almann, who was called a philosopher in his own right, reflected the teaching of John in his vocabulary.³⁰ Eubald, who taught in the archdiocese of Reims, although apparently after John's death, compiled a florilegium of Erigenian thoughts.³¹ Heiric, the student of Lupus of Ferrières and of Haimo of Auxerre, was on intimate terms with Wulfred, the abbot of Saint-Merard in Soissons and later archbishop of Bourges (866-876) whom John Scottus graced in the *Periphyseon* with the title "scholarly collaborator." Heiric was the first master both to cite the *Periphyseon* and to draw upon John's sermon, *Vox Spirituallis*.³² Sedulius Scottus borrowed from John's *Annotations* in the course of his

own commentary on Donatus Maier.³³ Martin included Greek words from John's poetry among the teaching texts he compiled in his Greek-Latin glossary and grammar.³⁴ This brief listing offers impressive testimony to contradict the general notion that John was a figure isolated by his genius in the ninth century. He was part and parcel of the scholastic currents of his time. Elements of his teaching survived in the notes of his students and colleagues. Several additional references, unlike the ones to which I have just alluded, were made by anonymous masters.

Whoever owned Paris, B. N., lat. 12949, a compilation of logical treatises and glosses that distinguish this book as one of the most interesting school books of the Carolingian period, quoted a fragment from one of John's poems that alludes to the temple of wisdom and also cited John for the definition of a Greek word.³⁵ A series of Vergil manuscripts preserve references to the pericopes of John as guides to understanding the life of the poet.³⁶ A medical recipe for the removal of hair cites the oral testimony of John on the subject.³⁷ An anonymous ninth-century author of a letter asked his correspondent how his community sings the response when the antepenult is sharp "*secundum doctrinam Iohannis Scotti*." Interestingly, the author's very next question concerned the definition of the mechanical arts which he learned from Memo, apparently John's successor at the palace school at Compiègne.³⁸ References to John, placed marginally opposite texts relevant to his teaching, occur scores of times in a manuscript loosely associated with the circle of Sedulius.³⁹

Finally, I wish to draw attention to two recently discovered, but as yet anonymous, figures whose notes reflect intimate contact with John Scottus. The first is known to modern students of Erigena simply as "i²," one of the two Irish hands found in the margins of John's works. The hand "i¹" has been identified as that of John himself. The unknown "i²" was not simply a scribe. He was responsible for original notes that mark him as a student of the great Irish master.⁴⁰ Another contemporary of John, this time a continental scholar, has recently been brought to light by Edouard Jeuneveuve. A series of glosses that he left in Paris, Bibl. de la Mazarine, 561, John's translation of the *Ambigua* of Maximus the Confessor, betray, according to Jeuneveuve, if not the thought of Erigena himself, the thought of "a disciple who had perfectly assimilated his teaching."⁴¹

These direct and indirect references to John's teaching no doubt can be augmented.⁴² Who, to cite one example, was the Stephanus who owned the ninth-century Reims copy of the *Periphyseon*? All that can be said thus far is that he was a contemporary of Hincmar of Laon, who presented Reims, Bibl. mun. 118 to him, and thus, could well have known personally the author of the *Periphyseon*.⁴³ Without being absolutely certain that I have canvassed every ninth-century reference to John as a teacher, I think that sufficient evidence has been brought to bear on the widespread impact John's teaching had on contemporaries.

I want now to turn briefly to a consideration of several Eriugenian texts that offer us our earliest look at John the teacher. I have already mentioned that the *Annotaciones* on Martianus Capella exists in several versions and that it was continually revised in light of Eriugene's ongoing commentary on the *De Nuptiis*.⁴⁴ Another text pre-eminently pedagogical is the series of biblical glosses ascribed to John and about which I wrote in 1976.⁴⁵ Since that study, I have been able to examine in greater detail what appears to be the earliest surviving manuscript (Paris, B.N., Lat. 3088) of the biblical glosses. From the five hundred or so glosses which survive, we can gain a good sense of John's early teaching. He was not commenting on texts as we usually understand that procedure. His notes explain words that refer to weights, measures, monetary values, place names, animal and plant life, vestments, and ornaments. The explanations are predominantly etymological and depend frequently upon the works of Pliny and Isidore of Seville. In relatively few instances are the notes more than a phrase or two in length. The suggestion that these notes emanated from elementary instruction at an early point in John's life is strengthened by the presence of about eighty Old Irish glosses. Old Irish presumably was used in the presence of young Irish students whose experience and command of Latin vocabulary were not yet sufficiently sophisticated. What remains to be determined about these glosses is not so much at what point in his career John taught them, but rather where he taught them. Was it in Ireland or on the continent? The fact that the five surviving manuscripts are all continental leads me to believe that the glosses were used in both locales. John would naturally use Irish among his compatriots to explain as unfamiliar biblical terms more clearly. He could also continue to use Irish words on the continent, as the manuscripts testify, where they could be affected by continental pupils. Hincmar of Laon, at least, liked to sprinkle his prose with

Irish words, learned perhaps from John.⁴⁶

To the *Annotaciones* and the biblical glosses, I want tentatively to add a very similar teaching text to John's dossier. In the Paris manuscript mentioned above, the glosses end abruptly at the bottom of folio 115v after a few notes on the preface to the book of Daniel. The succeeding quire or quires have been lost. What follows in the remaining fragment of the manuscript is a series of new glosses picked up in *mediis rebus* and copied by the same hand responsible for the biblical glosses. This second set of notes extends from the top of folio 116r to the bottom of 121v where they too are suddenly terminated by the loss of following quires. Approximately two hundred explanations of words, predominantly Greek, drawn from forty letters in the correspondence of St. Jerome remain. These glosses are more developed than those on the bible. They include definitions of words such as *phantasia* and *theophrasia* that were part of John's intellectual vocabulary. The method, essentially etymological, is reminiscent of the biblical notes. Persius, Servius, Donatus, Nonius Marcellus, and Plautus are among the authorities cited. Most of these references, however, are secondary since they are derived from Isidore of Seville's *Origines* from where almost the entire body of notes on Jerome's vocabulary has silently been drawn. This extremely close reliance on the Spaniard prohibits me at the moment from ascribing the notes definitely to Eriugene. If my further examination should prove them an authentic work of John Scotus, we shall have not only a new text to add to his dossier, but also another important witness to his career as a teacher. There can be no doubt concerning the connection between Martin Hibernensis and a series of teaching texts contained in Laon, Bibl. mun., 486. Martin wrote part of this most interesting book, corrected it throughout, and made notes in its margins. It has all the hallmarks of a teaching tool copied under his direction and used by him during his career as the *magister Laudunensis*.

In certain respects more is known of Martin than of John.⁴⁷ Martin's birth and death dates as well as a substantial portion of his library have survived. Martin was not the controversialist or striking original thinker that his compatriot was. He knew *Logos* of Martirius and had connections at the palace of Charles the Bald, but there is no indication that his reputation travelled much farther during his life or lived on very long after it. Martin is valuable precisely because he seems to be more typical than John of both Carolingian and Hibernian

Latin scholarship. With the exception of his knowledge of Greek, which was unusual and seems to have derived from Ireland, his curriculum could be duplicated by many Carolingian masters. Much of his teaching depended upon compilations that he either inherited or put together himself. One such teaching book is Leon, Bibl. mun., 468, a manuscript which ought to be published in facsimile as an excellent representative of ninth-century teaching manuals. To my knowledge, only one part of it has been published and it has never been studied in its entirety.⁴⁸ The book opens with a life of Vergil and continues with excerpts from Servius' prefaces to the Vergilian corpus. A guide to the Muses, Pates, gods and goddesses is followed by a short section, ff. 9r-11r, that seems out of place in this manuscript, but which is germane to our study of Hiberno-Latin pedagogy on the arts.⁴⁹

DE PROPRIETATE PHILOSOPHIAE ET DE VII LIBERALIBUS ARTIBUS fol.9r

Omnis philosophia in tres species dividitur, id est in phisicam, aethicam, logicam. Phisica enim natura, aethis mos, logos verbum vel ratio, quod est in naturales, morales, rationales. Phisica autem in quattuor divisiones partitur, id est arithmetica, geometrica, musica, astronomia quibus adherent astrologia, et medicina, et etiam minores artes quas artores, et fullones, et cimentarii exercent.

Phisicam vero invenit Tales milisius. Aethicam invenit Socrates et divisit eam in illi virtutes, id est prudentiam, iustitiam, fortitudinem, temperantiam. Logicam invenit Plato et divisit eam in duas partes, id est in rhetoricam et dialecticam quibus adheret grammatica. In grammatica enim scientiam recte loquendi discimus. In rhetorica vero percipimus qualiter ea quae didicimus proferamus. In his etiam tribus generibus philosophiae omnia divina scriptura consistit. Philosophia etiam dividitur in duas partes, id est in contemplativam et activam. Contemplativa vero in tres partes dividitur, id est in naturalem, doctrinalem, divinam. Actualis autem similiter in tres dividitur partes, id est in naturalem, dispensativam, civilem.

Proprietates vii liberalium artium. Grammaticus, litteratus, id est qui bene scit litteras. Rhetoricus vel rethor, id est eloquens qui bene scit litteras et bene potest eas loqui. Rhetorica enim APO TON PEGEIN dicitur, id est ab

hac copia locutionis. PEGEIN enim grece locutio dicitur. Ad ipsam pertinent tria genera causarum et illi genera orationum et silogismi et lex et sententia et catascavae et anascavae et prosopopeia et ethopoeia. Dialectica dicitur quia de dictis disputat. Lector enim grece dictio dicitur. Tante est enim ibi disputandi facultas et loquendi, ut in disputando verba secerant a falsis. Ad ipsam inis pertinet maxime philosophia et isagogae Porphyrii et categoriae / et periermales in fol. 9v quibus maxima subtilitas continetur et etiam silogismi et xv genera diffinitionum et topica.

Arithmetica et geometrica, musica, et astrologia generaliter mathematicae nominantur, id est doctrinales. Arithmetica id est numeraria, arithmon enim greci numerum dicunt, quem scriptores saecularium ideo inter disciplinas mathematicas primum esse voluerunt, quoniam ipsa nulla alia indiget disciplina.

Geometrica autem et musica et astronomia quae secuntur ut sint atque substantia istius agent similia. Non possunt enim esse sine numero. Geometrica dicitur terrae mensuratio sive aliarum rerum. Ge enim terra; metron, mensura. Ad ipsam enim

pertinent longitudes, latitudines, magnitudines, figurae variae, quadrangulum, triangulum, et figurarum numeri. Musica ars, id est peritia modulationis sono cantuque consistens. Et dicta musica per derivationem a Musis. In ipsa est enim modulatio et per ipsam quaeritur entia vis carminum et modulatio vocis.

Ad ipsam pertinent tres species, id est aronica, organica, rithmica. Aronica est omnis modulatio quae ex voce profertur. Organica est omnis modulatio quae spiritu flante completur ut in tubis, cornibus, fistulis, reliquis. Rithmica est omnis modulatio quae fit per chordas ex digitis. Nulla enim disciplina potest esse perfecta sine musica nam ipse numerus sine ipsa non voluitur et in omnibus omnis fit musica.

Astronomia id est astrorum lex. Astrologia, astrorum verbum. Inter astronomiam et astrologiam hoc differt quod astronomia ad certam rem pertinet, astrologia ad certam et incertam. Ad incertam enim pertinet dum in stellis auguratur. Qualem a caelando sacra dicitur et est volubilis, grece urmas dicitur. Sphaera species caeli est in rotundum forata et ex omnibus partibus aequaliter concava, ipse est enim rotunditas caeli.

Axes caeli sunt duo, id est septentrionalis qui nunquam nobis occidit et australis et dicuntur axes quia in .pna sphaera volvitur sicut rota in plastro vel quia ibi plastrum Iovis est. Qui duo axes dicuntur et poli. Dicti autem poli quod sint cikli *axium* / ex usu plastrorum a poliando scilicet nominati. Cardines caeli extremae partes axis sunt et dicti ite eo quod per eos vertitur caelum. Convexa caeli sunt eius extrema et a curvitate dicta quia ibi curvatur nobis caelum. Iannae caeli duae sunt, id est oriens et occidentes, per ipsas enim procedit sol. Climata vel plagae caeli sunt illi id est oriens, occidentes, septentrio qui vertex dicitur, australis. Quinque circuli etiam caeli sunt, id est septentrionalis, solstitialis, aequinoctialis, brumalis, australis. Interlunium est inter xxx et primam lunam. Stella est quaelibet singularis. Sidus plurimis stellis fit ut plades, reliqua. Astra autem stellae grandes ut orion. Septem planetae sunt in caelo quae ideo dicuntur planetae eo quod errant contra mundum quasi ANO RAANEC, id est ab errore.

DE INVENTIONE LIBERALIUM ARTIUM

Aristotelis inventit rethoricam et dialecticam. Pitagoras invenit arithmetica et musicam. Egiptii primum invenerunt geometricam. Celsi et Egiptii primi invenerunt astrologiam. Greci tamen dicunt eam invenisse primo Athlantes unde dixerunt eam sustinere caelum. Ypocrates invenit medicinam artem et medicina dicitur a modo, id est temperamento ut non satis sed paulatim adhibeatur. Immoderatio enim omnis non salutem sed periculum affert. Ad *ipsum* enim pertinet cibus et potus, tegmen et defensio omnis corporis.

Sillogismus grece, latine argumentatio dicitur. Sillogismus igitur est propositio et assumptionis confirmationisque extrema conclusio, ut est occidit, inimicus es, occidisti enim. Catachresis est confirmatio propositae rei. Anaschresis autem contraria est superiori. Ravincit enim non esse, quod natum, aut factum, aut dictum esse proponitur. Prosopoeia est cum fingitur persona et sermo inanimalium rerum ut dicuntur montes et flumina et arbores et patria loqui. Ethopoeia vero est in qua personam hominis fingimus pro exprimentis affectibus aetatis, videlicet studiis, fortibus, laetitiis,

sexus, meroris, audaciae. Nam cum piratas persona accipitur audax oratio demonstratur. Pirata enim est latro nationis qui fuit multum / audaces cum vero feminae sermo stimulat, sexui convenire oratio debet et mollis. Hic nunc diximus de sexu et audacia. Quare si vis de aetate, studio, fortuna, reliqua. Haec ad rethoricam pertinent.

Isagoga grece, latine introductio dicitur eorum scilicet quae philosophiam incipiunt. Genus introductur enim ad demonstrandam proprietatem, speciem, differentiam, proprium, accidens, ut puta, homo (id est species) est animal (genus) rationale (differentia), mortale (differentia ab angelis), risibile (proprium), sensus disciplinasque (accidens) capax. Ista enim v introductur in Isagogis. Categoriae grece, latine praedicamenta dicuntur quibus per varias significationes omnis sermo conclusus est. Categoriarum autem species x sunt, id est substantia, quantitas, qualitas, relatio, situs, locus, tempus, habitus, agere et pati, ut est hoc exemplum: Augustinus (substantia), magnus (quantitas), orator (qualitas), filius illius (relatio), etens (situs), in templo (locus), hodie (tempus), infuletus (habitus), disputando (actus), instigatur (passio). Istis enim x praedicamentis universalitas constat.

Periermenias grece, latine interpretamenta dicuntur in quibus maxime subtilitas fit. Omnis quippe res, quae una est et uno significatur sermone, aut per nomen intelligitur aut per verbum; quae duae partes interpretantur totum quicquid conceperit mens ad eloquendum. Periermenias enim dicitur interpretamentum per nomen aut verbum ex affirmatione et negatione, ut Cicero disputat, Cicero non disputat. Ita sibi opponitur, ut dum vivit Cicero alterum eorum necessario sit. Et ipso mortuo falsum est quod disputat, verum tamen est quod non disputat. Aut stultus aut ille aut sapiens, quodcumque horum alterum verum est; cum ipse esse destiterit utraque falsa sunt, quis ille qui non est neque stultus neque sapiens esse potest, reliqua. In qua periermenia vii species fiunt, id est nomen, verbum, oratio, enuntiatio, affirmatio, negatio, contradictio. Utilitas enim periermeniarum tanta est et ut his interpretamentis etiam sillogismi fiunt. Topica sunt eodem argumentorum vel loci, id est eodem dialecticae artis, / id est de locis ubi de argumentis disputatur. Haec ad dialecticam pertinent.

Martinus Hiberniensis 4 logica ex logus 36 Arithmetica, -h- supracr;
 45 magnitudines, M supracr. scilicet ut in campis et vineis videtur
 46 numeri, M in marg. <e>t linamenta 58-60 M in marg. <C>AELIO
 ET <PAR>TIBUS <EU>S 66 pollendo, M supracr. id est ornando, ornantur
 enim et planantur a rois 72 N in marg.: convexum enim curvum dicitur
 85 Caldei, M in marg.: ut abraham 85 egyptii, cod. egyptii 95
 Ananias, M in marg.: id est redarguunt impugnant 101 affectibus,
 M in marg.: id est voluptatibus 109 Genus, in marg. addit M 111-121
 (id est species) - (passio) supracr. 112 (differentia), N hab.
 (differentia)

2 Omnis - 7 medicina, Isidore de Seville, *Differentias*, 2.39 (Pl 83;
 92a-94a) 7 et etiam - 8 asserunt, Jerome, Ep. 8, 6 (ed. Hilberg, 1: 452,
 10-13) 9 Phisicam - 13 dialecticam, Isidore de Seville, *Origines* (ed.
 W. M. Lindsay), 2.24, 4-7 13 in grammatica - 15 proferamus, *Orig.* 2.22
 15 In his - 21 civilis, *Orig.* 2.24, 8-11 25 Rethorica enim - 26 dicitur,
Orig. 2.1.1 26 Ad ipsam - 29 athoposia, *Orig.* 2.4.7, 9-14 29 Dialectica-
 35 topica, *Orig.* 2.12.14, 25-30 36 Arithmetica - 42 auxilio, *Orig.* 3.1
 43 Geometria - 46 numeri, *Orig.* 3.10; 46 Musica - 55 musica, *Orig.*
 3.15. 1; 3.19; 3.21. 1; 3.19.1; 3.20.1; 3.22; 3.17.1
 57 Astronomia - 81 erroris, *Orig.* 3.24, 27, 32, 36-40, 42, 44, 55, 60,
 67 83 Aristotelis - 91 corporis, *Orig.* 2.2.1; 2.22.2; 3.2.1; 3.16.1;
 3.10.1; 3.25.1; 4.3; 4.2.1 92 Silogismus - 107 pertinent, *Orig.* 2.11.1;
 2.12.1; 2.13.1-2; 2.14.1-2 107 Isagoga - 140 pertinent, *Orig.* 2.25.1,
 5-8; 2.26.1-2; 2.26.5, 11; 2.27.1, 4; 7; 2.29.16; 2.30.1

Martin's manuscript continues with short descriptions of philo-
 sophers, poets, sibyls, magicians, and pagan deities, drawn largely
 from Fulgentius the Mythographer, before it arrives at the principal
 texts in the book, a long unpublished glossary on Vergil (ff. 18r-51v:
 "De mythosis Virgilii") and a similarly unedited glossary on the
 letters of the poet Sedulius (ff. 52r-61v).

Obviously much of the text on the arts is derivative. Its general
 organization, its debt to the *Differentias*, and even the brief excerpt
 from a letter of Jerome place it among a series of Hiberno-Latin texts
 on the arts. Before examining its place in this tradition, I think it
 important to point out that the compiler, if he is not Martin himself,

has skillfully moved through books 2, 3, and 4 of the *Origines* for most
 of his material, not slavishly copying out Isidore's text but condensing
 it, rephrasing it, and sometimes rearranging it to fit his organization.
 A few examples will indicate his approach to his sources. At lines 15-
 16, where our text has "In his etiam tribus generibus philosophiae omnis
 divina scriptura consistit," Isidore (*Orig.* 2.24.8) reads: "In his
 quippe tribus generibus philosophiae etiam eloquia divina consistunt."
 In substituting "omnis divina scriptura" for "eloquia divina," Martin's
 text has condensed three lines in the *Origines* where Isidore referred
 to the specific Biblical books. In line 17, Martin's text has preferred
 the word *contemplativa* for one of the parts of philosophy in place of
 Isidore's *inspectiva* (*Orig.* 2.24.9).

The process of selection and abridgment quite often involved more
 than a change in a word or two. Concerning music, the two texts say
 essentially the same thing, but Martin's text seems simpler and more
 direct.

<i>Orig.</i> 3.17.1	lines 34-36
Iteque sine Musica nulla dis- ciplina potest esse perfecta, nihil enim sine illa. Nam et ipse mundus quidem harmonia sonorum fertur esse compositus, et caelum ipsum sub harmoniae modulationis revolvitur.	Mulla enim disciplina potest esse perfecta sine musica, nam ipse mundus sine ipse non voluitur et in omnibus omnis fit musica.

Isidore's famous distinction between astronomy and astrology has
 been similarly paraphrased in the Leon manuscript where particular care
 seems to have been taken to avoid describing the "certain" knowledge
 that astrology might yield.

<i>Orig.</i> 3.24; 3.27.1-2	lines 57-60
Astronomia est astrorum lex... Inter Astronomiam autem et Astro- logiam aliqd differt. Nam Astro- nomia caeli conversionem, ortus, obitus motusque siderum continet, vel quae ex causa ita vocatur. Astrologia vero partim naturalis, partim superstitiosa est. Naturalis, dum consequitur solis	Astronomia, id est astrorum lex. Astrologia, astrorum verbum. Inter astronomiam et astrologiam haec differt quod astronomia ad certum rem pertinet, astrologia ad certum et incertum. Ad incertum enim pertinet dum in stellis auguratur.

et lunae cursus, vel stellarum
certas temporum stationes. Super-
stitiosa vero est illa quam
mathematici sequuntur, qui in
stellis augurantur....

This process of distillation of another's work is not surprising in early medieval pedagogy. One would hardly expect a master to create definitions of the arts, their properties, and their invention. One would, however, expect a master to reword and rearrange material to fit his own needs which in Laon 468 were not to serve as a full-blown disquisition on the arts, but rather to provide an introduction to the arts in a book dedicated primarily to grammatical study.

Martin was not alone among Irish masters in incorporating a discussion of the arts and the division of wisdom in a grammar book. The *Anonymous ad Cuimannus* of the seventh century with its schema prefaces an Irish commentary on Donatus Maior in a manuscript from the first half of the eighth century.⁵⁰ Virgilius Maro included a discussion of the divisions of wisdom in his chapter on metrics.⁵¹ It was as if, Dias y Dias has remarked, grammatical tradition demanded a general discussion of the classification of the arts in order to justify the emphasis accorded grammar.⁵²

The organization of Martin's text reinforces what its context reveals of its tradition. The text may be divided into four sections. The first and shortest section, lines 2-21, treats the properties of philosophy and the arts. The schema here comes from Isidore's *Differentiae*, a source already mentioned above as favoured by John Scottus and other Irish masters. A second source, a passage from Jerome's fifty-third letter, is also called upon when Martin elaborates on the minor arts. The same Hieronymian passage was also cited in the letter to Cuimannus.⁵³ The second section, lines 22-81, abandons the scheme of the *Differentiae* when it describes the properties of the seven "traditional" liberal arts as discussed in Isidore's *Origines*. In the third section, lines 83-91, Martin's text returns to the scheme of the first section when it lists briefly the subdivisions of logic and physics (rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, music, geometry, astrology, and medicine) and their inventors. Grammar which "adheres" to dialectic in the view of the *Differentiae*, is conspicuous by its absence. Two long paragraphs, lines 92-140, on rhetoric and dialectic terminate the text on the arts.

The organization of Martin's text poses several questions. Why, first of all, does it oscillate between two schemes of the arts? And secondly, why did Martin conclude his notes after elaborating upon only two of the arts, rhetoric and dialectic? One might answer the first question by stating that rival schemata for the arts were implicit in Isidore himself and in Martin's predecessors, as Bischoff and Dias y Dias have shown in their studies of the problem. For the solution to the second question, I would suggest that Martin's material reflects parts of yet another scheme, one that was entered into early Alcuin manuscripts between texts of the Anglo-Saxon's *Dialogus de Rhetorice et Virtutibus* and his *De Dialectica*.⁵⁴ The unknown early Carolingian master responsible for this elaborate table encompassing the divisions of rhetoric, philosophy, and the virtues has much in common with the tradition from which Martin's material drew. He divided Philosophy into Physics, Ethics, and Logic. Physics he broke down into the seven-fold division familiar from the *Differentiae*. Logic consisted of dialectic and rhetoric. Before he considered the division of Ethics into the four principle virtues, the master treated dialectic separately, having already analyzed rhetoric at the beginning of his schema. Martin's manuscript does not include any material on Ethics and in the discussion of rhetoric is not as elaborate as the similar discussion in the Alcuin manuscripts. Nevertheless, the existence of the schema, which closely resembles the organization of Martin's text and which served as a kind of bridge between Alcuin's pedagogical works on rhetoric and dialectic, offers a precedent, to be sure, although misapplied in a Virgil manuscript, for concluding a discussion of the arts with two paragraphs on rhetoric and dialectic.

The final question is perhaps the most important of all. What did all these traditions have to do with Martin's actual teaching? Were they as Dias y Dias has written "un détail érudit"? In the case of Martin, the evidence is clear that the few leaves devoted to the arts in his manuscript were not there for his own edification or to display his erudition to his colleagues. They were intended to serve as the basis for his actual teaching. Martin's marginal notes, introduced by an "ad eum" or a "ad alium," show Martin clarifying his text for his students.⁵⁵ At lines 103-107 we even hear the master gently prodding his students to do some work on their own: "Sic nunc distinas de eorum et suis. Quare si vis de arte, studio, fortasse, reliqua."

the Ninth Century," *SN* 3rd Ser., 13 (1972): 933.

⁹De Praedestinatione contra Joannem Scotum, PL 115: 1013A-1014A; and Kenney, pp. 577-78 (Nos. 382-85).

¹⁰MGH Leges 2, Capitularia Regum Francorum, 1: 78-79 (no. 29). For Alcuin's part in the redaction of this letter, see L. Wallach, *Alcuin and Charlemagne: Studies in Carolingian History and Literature*, rev. and amended reprint (New York, 1968), pp. 198-226.

¹¹De Grammatica, PL 101: 853. Its significance and fortuna have been studied by M. Th. d'Alverny. "La Sagesse et ses sept filles: Recherches sur les allégories de la Philosophie et des arts libéraux du IXe au XIIe siècle," in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grégoire*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1946-49), 1: 245-78.

¹²See n. 4, above, for Mathon's paper, and d'Alverny, pp. 250-51.

¹³C. E. Lutz, ed., *Johannis Scotti: Annotationes in Marcianum*, Medieval Academy of American Publications no. 34 (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), p. 64.

¹⁴De Divina Praedestinatione Liber, PL 122: 358a.

¹⁵See Contreni, *Cathedral School of Laon*, pp. 113-17.

¹⁶See Cora E. Lutz, ed., *Dunstan Glosses in Martianus* (Lancaster, Pa., 1944), pp. 22-23. For the authorship of this commentary, see J. J. Contreni, "Three Carolingian Texts Attributed to Laon: Reconsiderations," *SN*, 3rd ser., 17, 2 (1976): 802-13.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 23: "But although any individual art might have a nature appropriate to itself, it cannot exist in itself but must exist necessarily in some subordinate substance (as a ground); therefore, it is not able to come from itself if it does not exist in itself and cannot return to itself so long as it is contained in some other substance. Thus it is necessary that we understand (accident) in a different and better way. Every natural art (therefore) is found materially in human nature. It follows that all men by nature possess natural arts, but because, on account of the punishment for the sin of the first man, they (are obscured) in the souls of men and sunk in a profound ignorance, in teaching we do nothing but recall to our present understanding the same arts which are stored deep in our memory. And when our minds are occupied with other cares, in neglecting the arts we do nothing but let go of them as they return to that from which they have been recalled."

¹⁸Cora E. Lutz, "Remigius' Ideas on the Classification of the Seven Liberal Arts," *Traditio* 12 (1956): 83-86; and d'Alverny, p. 231.

¹⁹J. Barbé, ed., *Johannis Scotti Eriugena Expositiones in Hieronymianum Coelestem*, CCCM (Turnhout, 1975), 31: 16 (lines 540-61).

²⁰De Divina Praedestinatione Liber, PL 122: 430c.

²¹Ibid., cols. 866a-870c.

NOTES

¹Scotus Peregrinus Roma Redus Beneficium Expetit, MGH Epistolae 8: 196.1: "Non sua grammaticus neque sermone Latino peritus..."

²Although in obvious need of updating, J. F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical* (New York, 1929; rep. 1966), especially chapters 6 and 7, is the most convenient guide to the work of Irishmen on the continent. More recently, see the fine editions of the grammatical works of Hurchach and Sedulius Scottus prepared by L. Molts and B. Löffstedt in CCCM vols. 40, 40A, 40B, 40C.

³To the fundamental study of M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Erigène: sa vie son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Louvain, 1933; rep. Brussels, 1969), must now be added the introduction to E. Jaumau, ed., *Jean Scot. Homélie sur le prologue de Jean, Sources chrétiennes*, no. 151 (Paris, 1969), as well as the studies published in J. J. O'Meara and L. Sialer, eds., *The Mind of Eriugena* (Dublin, 1973), and in *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la Philosophie*, Laon, 7-12 juillet 1975 Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, no. 561 [Paris, 1977]. Of great help is M. Brämmer, "A Bibliography of Publications in the Field of Eriugenian Studies, 1800-1975," *SN*, 3rd Ser., 18, 1 (1977): 401-47.

⁴See C. Mathon, "Les formes et la signification de la pédagogie des arts libéraux au milieu du IXe siècle: L'enseignement palatin de Jean Scot Erigène," in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Age* (Actes du quatrième congrès international de philosophie médiévale [Paris and Montréal, 1967]), pp. 47-64; pp. 19-24 in Jaumau's edition cited in n. 3 above and his "Quelques échos de la philosophie médiévale," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 45 (1978): 79-129; J. J. Contreni, "The Biblical Glosses of Malmo of Auxerre and John Scotus Eriugena," *Speculum* 51 (1976): 411-34; as well as several studies in the acts of the Dublin and Laon colloquia cited in the previous note.

⁵The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930. *Its Manuscripts and Masters*, Münchner Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung, vol. 29 (Munich, 1978).

⁶Florus of Lyon, "De Tribus Epistolis Liber," PL 121: 1052. See also Cappuyns, pp. 53-59, and Kenney, pp. 573-77 (no. 381).

⁷See G. Schirmpf, "Zur Frage der Authentizität unserer Texte von Johannes Scottus' 'Annotationes in Martianum,'" in *The Mind of Eriugena*, pp. 125-39.

⁸See J. J. Contreni, "A propos de quelques manuscrits de l'école de Laon au IXe siècle: Découvertes et problèmes," *Le Moyen Age* 78 (1972): 9-14; and, idem, "The Formation of Laon's Cathedral Library in

²² See J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Seville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1959), 1: 345-49; and Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz, "Les arts libéraux d'après les écrivains espagnols et insulaires aux X^e et XI^e siècles," in *Arts libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Age*, (cited above, n. 4), p. 40.

²³ *Differentias* 2.39 (Pl. 83: 93d-95c).

²⁴ See the text printed below, lines 12-13. Hiberno-Latin discussions of the arts have been studied by B. Bischoff, "Eine verschollene Einteilung der Wissenschaften," in *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966), 1: 273-88, esp. p. 286. (This study originally appeared in *Archiv für die Geschichte der Philosophie und der Literatur des Mittelalters* 25 [1958]: 5-20. See also Díaz y Díaz, pp. 42-46.)

²⁵ Díaz y Díaz p. 46.

²⁶ C. Leonardi, "Nuove voci poetiche tra secolo IX e XI," *SM* 3rd ser., 2 (1961): 150. "Sollers artis etiam prima florentie iuventa / Qua colitur aumus, unus et ipse Deus."

²⁷ See Contrenti, *Cathedral School of Leon*, pp. 140-41.

²⁸ See L. Delisle, "Notice sur les manuscrits originaux d'Adémar de Chabannes," *Notices et extraits* 35-1 (1896): 311-12.

²⁹ *Gesta Episcoporum Autisiodorensium*, *MGH Scriptores* 13: 399, 12-18.

³⁰ See A. Wilmart, "La lettre philosophique d'Almanne et son contenu littéraire," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 3 (1928): 285-319.

³¹ G. Mathon, "Un florilège érigénien à l'abbaye de Saint-Amand au temps d'Hucbald," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 20 (1953): 302-311.

³² For Hæric, see R. Quadri, *I Collectanea di Enrico di Auxerre* (Fribourg, 1966); E. Jeuneau, "Dans le sillage de l'Erigène: Une homélie d'Hæric d'Auxerre sur le prologue de Jean," *SM* 3rd ser., 11 (1970): 937-55; idem, "Influences érigénienues dans une homélie d'Hæric d'Auxerre," in *The Mind of Erigena*, pp. 114-23. For John's reference to Wulfstan, see Pl. 122: 1022a.

³³ L. Heistedt ed., *Sedulius Scottus In Donati Artem Maiorem*, *CCCM*, 40B (Turnhout, 1877): 95.57-59.

³⁴ Leon, Bibl. 444, ff. 294v-96v ("Item gratia de veribus Iohannis Scotti"), ff. 297r-298v ("Item versus greci"). See *MGH Poet. Lat.* 3: 340-42; and Cappuyne, pp. 77-78.

³⁵ See the apparatus criticus for *MGH Poet. Lat.* 3: 537, (no. 8, II.1 and 3); Jeuneau, "Quisquilias," p. 117, n. 109; and Kenney, p. 591 (no. 402).

³⁶ See J. Brummer, *Vitae Vergilianae* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 62, lines 64-73, for the ninth-century Wolfenbüttel, Bibl. Herzog-August 4374 (Gud. lat. 70); idem, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der sogenannten Donat-Vita des Vergil," *Philologus* 72 (1913): 287-91; J. J. Savage, "The Scholia in the Virgil of Tours," *Medieval Studies in Classical Philology* 36 (1925) 163, M. Perschke, "Eine vita Vergili," *Neue Studien* 4 (1881) 168-69; P. Lehmann, "Von den Quellen und Autoritäten irisch-lateinischer Texte," *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1959-62), 3: 143-48, for Sankt Paul im Lavanttal 86b/l.

³⁷ See Kenney, p. 588, no. 398; and J. J. Contrenti, "The Study and Practice of Medicine in Northern France during the Reign of Charles the Bald," in J. Sommerfeldt and E. R. Elders, eds., *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 6 and 7 (Kalamazoo, 1976): 45, I am preparing an edition of the remedy.

³⁸ *MGH Epistolae*, 6: 184, lines 20-22. See Contrenti, "Three Carolingian Texts," pp. 798-802.

³⁹ For Bern Burgerbibliothek 363, see Kenney, pp. 559-60 (no. 364, ii), and my forthcoming "The Irish in the Western Carolingian Empire According to James F. Kenney and Bern, Burgerbibliothek 363." The names of other Irishmen, particularly that of Sedulius Scottus, also appear in the codex.

⁴⁰ For this matter, see T. A. N. Bishop, "Autographs of John Scot," in *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la Philosophie*, pp. 89-94; and, in the same volume, B. Bischoff and E. Jeuneau, "Ein neuer Text aus der Gedankenwelt des Johannes Scottus," pp. 109-16.

⁴¹ "Quisquilias," p. 128.

⁴² The Eriugenian definition of *scollia* discussed by Jeuneau, "Quisquilias," pp. 105-07, also appears in Paris, B. N., lat. 3095, a manuscript from the late ninth century. During the same period, or more probably early in the tenth century, a tradition that a certain Aldeimus was John's brother circulated. See Contrenti, *The Cathedral School of Leon*, pp. 87-88. When Hincmar of Reims ridiculed his nephew, Hincmar of Laon, for using Scottus et alia barbara in his writings, was he indirectly laughing out at John who used his native language in teaching? See Pl. 126: 448b.

⁴³ See H. Lortoliet, *Reims*, 2 vols., *Catalogue général des bibliothèques publiques de France: Départements*, vols. 38-39 (Paris, 1904-1906) 1: 109-12, and 2: 191-92, for manuscripts 118 and 875. For Hincmar's connection with MS 118 see Contrenti, *Cathedral School of Laon*, p. 33, n. 9, indirectly confirmed by J. Devienne, *Hincmar, archevêque de Reims, 845-882*, 3 vols. (Geneva, 1975-76), 3: 1486, n. 6. There has been no comment, as far as I know, on the identity of Scaphanus of Reims.

⁴⁴ See above, note 7.

⁴⁵ See above, note 4.

⁴⁶ See above, note 42.

⁴⁷See Contreni, *Cathedral School of Leão*, ch. 8 ("Martin Hibernensis [819-875], *Magister Laudensis*" and ch. 9 ("The Reading of Martin Hibernensis").

⁴⁸See Contreni, "A propos de quelques manuscrits," pp. 14-28, where I published and discussed a life of Vergil from ff. 1r-2r. In many places Martin supplied words in the text in spaces left blank by the principal copyist. My first thought was that the copyist encountered Irish abbreviation symbols with which he was unfamiliar and left them for the master to decipher (*ibid.*, p. 27). Suzanne Martinet, in her general discussion of the text presented below, "Les arts Libéraux à Leão au IX^e siècle, in *Actes du 95^e Congrès des Sociétés savantes* (Reims, 1970): *Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1975), I: 61-62, suggested that the copyist had difficulty with the Tironian notes of his exemplar.

⁴⁹Words supplied by Martin in the text have been italicized. His other additions are listed in the apparatus. I have retained the orthography of the manuscript, but have expended a caudata to -as-

⁵⁰See Bischoff, "Einteilung der Wissenschaften," pp. 282-88.

⁵¹See Díaz y Díaz, pp. 43-44, who presents other examples.

⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 44. Marius Victorinus provided the precedent for appending a discussion of the arts to a grammatical treatise. See his *Ars Grammatica* in H. Keil, ed., *Grammatici Latini*, 6 (Leipzig, 1874): 187-89.

⁵³Bischoff, "Einteilung der Wissenschaften," pp. 284-85.

⁵⁴See PL 101: 947-48, esp. paragraphs 9-12 of the schema. See also Bischoff, pp. 275-76.

⁵⁵Martin's references in lines 39 and 60 to the agricultural world are not casual allusions. In his copy of Origen's homilies on Numbers, Leão, Bibl. mun. 298, f. 1v, Martin calculated the harvests from various fields and thus would seem to have been involved in managing the cathedral's lands.

THE PRESENT STATE OF ANGLO-LATIN STUDIES

Michael Lapidge
University of Cambridge

The last years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth were halcyon days for the study of Anglo-Latin literature. In these years the foundations of the subject were laid by a number of scholars of prodigious industry and learning, working in various parts of the world. In retrospect, the most astonishing feature of the learning of these men was its incomparable range - embracing first-hand knowledge of manuscripts and other primary sources of disparate nature such as charters or annals, auxiliary disciplines such as liturgy or patristic thought, as well as intimate acquaintance with the tradition of Latin literature, classical and medieval. I am thinking of British scholars such as Charles Plummer, whose edition of Bede's historical writings¹ is likely never to become outdated; or W. H. Stevenson, whose edition of Asser² is a treasury of information for the darkest period of Anglo-Saxon history, and whose edition of the Crawford charters³ sets the model for the way such documents should be treated; or W. H. Lindsay, whose unrivalled knowledge of the Latin language allowed him to establish the bases on which the study of glossaries⁴ - an essential aspect of the education of Anglo-Saxons and all other non-Latin speaking cultures - could proceed. In America a number of scholars active in the early decades of the twentieth century provided later students of Anglo-Latin with tools which have become indispensable: E. A. Lowe, with whose *Codices Latini Antiquiores*⁵ every study of early insular culture must begin; M. L. W. Laistner, whose *Texts of Bede manuscripts*⁶ is the starting point for serious work on that author, and whose editions of Bede's exegetical writings should be regarded as models for scholars editing insular biblical commentaries;⁷ or

Insular Latin Studies, ed. Michael Herren,
Papers in Medieval Studies 1 (Turnhout:
Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981)
pp. 45-82

C. W. Jones, whose edition of Bede's computistical works sets the confusing obscurities of medieval computus in a clear light for the first time.⁸ In Germany, a series of scholars involved in the production of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*⁹ provided later scholarship with a series of veritably monumental editions of Anglo-Latin texts that are unlikely to be superseded, at least in the foreseeable future. Ernst Dümmler's editions of Alcuin's poems and letters,¹⁰ Michael Tsaghl's edition of the Bonifatian correspondence,¹¹ Rudolf Ewald's edition of Aldhelm,¹² and editions of a number of minor Anglo-Latin texts (such as the *Miracula Myriae*) by Karl Strecker.¹³ One of these MGH editors deserves to be remembered with particular esteem by students of Anglo-Latin: Wilhelm Levison. His editions of the *vita* of Boniface are peerless,¹⁴ and his book *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*,¹⁵ perhaps the finest monograph available on an Anglo-Latin subject, ought constantly to be emulated both in the breadth of its subject matter and in the painstaking accuracy of its detailed documentation. Without these men, we might still be working in the Dark Ages which they succeeded in illuminating. They were giants; and we are the dwarves standing on their shoulders.

The death of Levison in 1947 hatched (if I may borrow a phrase from Pope) "a new Saturnian age of Lat." It is perhaps inevitable that the age succeeding that of great pioneers will be less inclined to break further new ground, more inclined to draw back, recast and popularise the work of the predecessors. Hence the succeeding age has been characterised by works of popularisation (one thinks of several monographs by E. S. Duckett¹⁶) and translation. Editions of Anglo-Latin works undertaken by scholars such as Bertram Colgrave¹⁷ and Alistair Campbell¹⁸ often lacked critical judgment and historical perspective, and will eventually need to be redone. So too the work of this more recent period has often been characterised by unfamiliarity with primary sources (particularly in manuscript) and inexperience with the peculiarities of Anglo-Latin. Two volumes published in 1967 could potentially have been valuable instruments of research, but unfortunately fell short of realising that potential: J. D. A. Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English 397-1066*¹⁹ and the first volume of W. F. Bolton's *History of Anglo-Latin Literature*.²⁰ Nevertheless, during the last decade one has sensed a quickening of interest in Anglo-Latin studies - witnessed (say) by the amount of space devoted to bibliography of Anglo-Latin research in periodicals such as *Anglo-Saxon*

England and the Old English Newsletter. The conference at York University (of which the present volume records the proceedings) similarly attests to this quickening interest. In the remarks that follow, I shall attempt to give further evidence of this interest; but I shall be most concerned with drawing attention to those areas which (in my opinion) are deserving of scholarly pursuit.²¹

It is generally accepted that the Augustinian mission in the early seventh century left no identifiable trace in later Latin records. Although we know from Bede that Latin teachers were available at Canterbury in the 630s, and that by 644 at least one native Englishman had been trained in Latin to a sufficient degree to be ordained bishop (Ithamar of Rochester), we have no idea of what books were used by the early Italian missionaries, or what methods they employed in instructing the uncouth English.²² However, some faint traces of Italian influence deriving from Augustine's mission may be detectable in the earliest Anglo-Saxon diplomas, as Pierre Chaplais has argued,²³ and more may come to light. But until the time of Theodore and Hadrian there is no tangible evidence of Latin culture in England. Henceforth, we are better informed. Hadrian will no doubt remain a shadowy figure (he appears in our records only as a correspondent of Aldhelm, and possibly of Julian of Toledo²⁴), but we have more evidence - although it is scattered widely - for assessing the impact of Theodore.²⁵ As evidence of Theodore's impact, Bede noted that there are students surviving in his day "who knew Latin and Greek just as well as their native tongue" (*HE* IV.2). Theodore's Greek learning in particular has left discoverable traces in our records. Most importantly, Professor Blackhoff has drawn attention to a series of biblical glosses (on the Pentateuch and gospels) in an eleventh-century manuscript in Milan (Ambros. M.79 sup.); these combine knowledge of Greek patristic literature with that of Anglo-Saxon weights and measures.²⁶ Since Theodore is mentioned as an authority at one point, Blackhoff has inferred that the glosses derive directly from his teaching. The most interesting feature of the glosses is the wide range of Greek patristic authorities from which they quote: John Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzen, and others. Blackhoff is preparing an edition of these glosses - one of the principal desiderata of Anglo-Latin studies - and our assessment of Theodore's impact must clearly await the publication of his edition. The question then to be put is: how many of the Greek patristic texts did Theodore bring with

him to England, and how many was he simply quoting from memory? A preliminary answer concerning one of the texts may, perhaps, be given. Peter Kitson, in a recent study of the tradition of the Old English lapidary,²⁷ has demonstrated that a work of Epiphanius underlies Anglo-Saxon lapidary tradition, and has conjectured that the (otherwise rare) Greek text of Epiphanius may have been known at Canterbury in Theodore's time, whence the later English tradition derived. Other Greek texts were certainly studied there. A Greek acrostic poem on the day of judgement, beginning *INLOYT XPITOTOE CROY YIOE IOTHPOT ITAYPOE*, was apparently translated into Latin hexameters at Canterbury,²⁸ since Aldhelm on four occasions quotes from the Latin translation. Similarly, Edmund Bishop demonstrated that a Greek litany preserved in the so-called "Aethelstan Psalter" (London, British Library, MS Cotton Galba A.xviii) must have come to England in the late seventh century, since a Latin translation of it is found in the earliest Anglo-Saxon prayer book, British Library, MS Royal 2.A.xv; it is not unreasonable to think of Theodore in this connection. When scattered evidence such as this has been collected, we may be able to form a clearer notion of the Greek studies under Theodore's direction described by Bede.

Curiously, Aldhelm, does not appear to have learned any Greek. But his accomplishment in Latin - bearing in mind that he was of the first generation in Wessex to be converted to Christianity - was prodigious. His knowledge of classical Latin poetry, for example, was not rivaled by any subsequent Anglo-Saxon scholar; he even knew certain classical works such as Lucan's *Orpheus*, which has not survived and is known principally from Aldhelm's quotation of it.³⁰ In spite of the availability of Aldhelm's works in the excellent edition by Ewald,³¹ he has not received the attention he deserves - no doubt because of the prolixity and difficulty of his Latin. In an attempt to make Aldhelm more accessible to students of Anglo-Saxon culture, Michael Herren and I have recently published a translation of Aldhelm's prose writings;³² a second companion volume of his poetic works (translated by James Rosier and myself) is scheduled for publication next year. These translations will, hopefully, draw the attention of Anglo-Saxonists to Aldhelm. Meanwhile, Aldhelm's Latin style has recently been attracting scholarly attention, such that we have now come a long way from the earlier facile view which regarded Aldhelm (and anything else which proved difficult to translate) as "Hispanic." I would mention an extensive and excellent article by Michael Winterbottom³³ which

elucidates the continental origins of Aldhelm's mannered prose; and two brief but incisive articles (one by François Kerlouégan,³⁴ the other by John Narebon³⁵) which clarify the nature and sources of Aldhelm's vocabulary. But much essential work on Aldhelm remains to be done; I would signal two areas of especial importance.

First, the canon of Aldhelm's writings. For the past fifty years, his canon has more or less been fixed on what is printed between the covers of Ewald's edition, and is now in need of some reconsideration. I have recently suggested,³⁶ for example, that a colophon to the first of the rhetorical poems printed by Ewald as anonymous - which runs *finis carmen Aldhelmi* - is to be accepted on the highest authority (the manuscript in question, Vienna 751, was probably copied at Mainz from an exemplar compiled by Lui³⁷) and that this, the most interesting of the octosyllabic *carmina* rhythmic emanating from Aldhelm's circle, is in fact by the master himself. Likewise, we know from Bede (*HE* IV.2) that computational studies were part of the curriculum at Canterbury, and from Aldhelm's letter to Leuthar³⁸ that he was struggling with the complexities of the subject. This aspect of Aldhelm's learning has been neglected; but in a number of manuscripts, of either English origin or from continental centres with English connections, is found a lunar table which is described as *Ciclus Aldhelmi de cursu lunae per signa xli secundum graecos*.³⁹ Although this table was not known to Ewald, I see no reason not to regard it as Aldhelm's.

Another work which has been conjecturally attributed to Aldhelm⁴⁰ and which has recently attracted a considerable amount of scholarly attention, is the *Liber Monstrorum*,⁴¹ a compilation which, as its title fairly indicates, contains brief descriptions of some 120 monsters, beasts, and serpents. The work is unquestionably of Anglo-Saxon origin, as may be seen from the orthography of the earliest manuscripts and in particular of the name *Hygiea*, the Goathish king who figures prominently in *Beowulf*. There is even some late evidence to suggest that the work travelled in manuscript under Aldhelm's name.⁴² However, although the *Liber Monstrorum* shares many sources (such as Lucan's otherwise unknown poem *Orpheus*) and stylistic features with Aldhelm, I am hesitant to attribute it to Aldhelm.⁴³ But the question deserves further study.

A second area deserving of study is Aldhelm's sources. The extent of Aldhelm's reading was vast, and a study of his sources would give us a clear index to what books were available in Southumbria in the late seventh century. Such a study might take the form of

Laisner's model essay, "The Library of the Venerable Bede,"⁴⁴ but would ideally be supplemented by an account of the circulation of each text in manuscript in early medieval Europe (here Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores* would provide the starting point). I think that such supplementary information is necessary because otherwise we may be liable to misjudge an alleged verbal echo (Manitius, for example, thought he could detect borrowings from Corippus in Aldhelm;⁴⁵ but these are extremely tenuous, and the text of Corippus appears never to have left Italy⁴⁶), or to misrepresent the number of books at his avail. For example, in the prose *De Virginitate* Aldhelm apparently drew his accounts of exemplary virgins from some twenty separate *passiones*. I doubt that these would have come to him singly, but our knowledge of the compilation and circulation of *passionals* in this early period⁴⁷ (and, indeed, in the later period⁴⁸) is too hazy to allow of any estimate. Much may be learned from research in related disciplines. In a recent and continuing series of articles, J. E. Cross⁴⁹ has been studying the sources of the *Old English Martyrology*, using as the basis for his investigations a (personal) microfilm collection of all known pre-tenth-century *passionals*. As his work progresses, we will be able to get some impression of what, if any, *passionals* were available to the ninth-century compiler of the *Martyrology* in Mercia, and perhaps by extension backwards, what could have been known to Aldhelm a century earlier. A forthcoming study of the pre-Conquest library at Malmesbury by Rodney Thomson may also throw light on Aldhelm's sources.⁵⁰ It is essential, at any event, that knowledge gained from these various avenues of approach be co-ordinated.

Aldhelm was unquestionably the most proficient, but he was by no means the only, Latin writer active in Southumbria in the late seventh and early eighth century. Boniface and his correspondents attest to the immediate influence of Aldhelm's stylistic propanities but, although their correspondence is accessible in Tangl's excellent edition⁵¹ and a number of serviceable translations,⁵² it has seldom received the attention it merits. This collection can now be supplemented by other examples of early Anglo-Latin correspondence which have recently come to light. Pierre Chaplais, for example, has demonstrated that a letter of Bishop Walthere of London to the archbishop of Canterbury preserved in London, British Library, MS Cotton Augustus II.18, is in fact original, and is thus the earliest extant "letter close" from medieval Europe.⁵³ Patrick Sims-Williams has edited a

previously unknown letter in a Boulogne manuscript (74 [82]) written by one Burginda, who was active (as he thinks) at Bath Abbey in the late seventh or early eighth century.⁵⁴ Burginda was not as polished a writer as some of Boniface's female correspondents, but the works which she paraphrases and quotes (Vergil, Arator, and the anonymous *Carmen ad Flavianum Felicem de Resurrectione Mortuorum*) reveal fairly ambitious reading in Latin poetry. (Incidentally, the *Carmen...de Resurrectione Mortuorum* is not mentioned in Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English 597-1066*, but was clearly available in early Southumbria, since Boniface in his *Enigmat*,⁵⁵ also repeats one of its lines: another indication that our knowledge of what authors were studied in Anglo-Saxon England needs constant revision.) Nor was Burginda as accomplished as the English nun Hygeburg of Heidenheim,⁵⁶ whose extremely peculiar Latin has recently been the subject of a monograph by Eva Gottschaller,⁵⁷ and who deserves to be better known by students of Anglo-Latin.

There are many other aspects of Anglo-Latin culture in early Southumbria which have been receiving attention lately. The early Anglo-Saxon grammarians, especially Tatwine⁵⁸ and Boniface,⁵⁹ have been the subject of a number of editions and studies in recent years. An exhaustive edition and commentary of Boniface's *Ars Grammatica*, which has been prepared by Vivien Law,⁶⁰ will enable a sound evaluation to be made of what grammatical writings were available at Buntingford (Whitwell) in the late seventh century. Dr. Law's studies have also succeeded in identifying a number of short grammatical tracts of undoubted insular origin, such as the *Declinationes Roderici* or the *Coniugationes Verborum*, which are preserved only in later continental manuscripts but which were demonstrably known to and employed by Boniface and Tatwine; her forthcoming edition of these will do much to elucidate the study of Latin in early Anglo-Saxon England.

Hand in hand with the study of grammar went the study of metre. Each of the major Anglo-Latin authors of this early period - Aldhelm, Boniface, and Bede - devoted himself to the composition of a treatise on metre.⁶¹ It is interesting to ask how the theory of metrics was set out in treatises such as these squares with the metrical practices met out in treatises such as these squares with the metrical practices of early Anglo-Latin poets. The Anglo-Saxons, we should not forget, were the first non-Latin speaking peoples to be faced with the problems of extensive metrical composition, and many of the finer points of quantitative verse (such as elision, iurus, or the various persons

within the line) must have eluded them at first.⁶² Neil Wright has been undertaking a detailed investigation of Anglo-Latin metrical practice,⁶³ and the preliminary results of his researches look very promising. It is demonstrable, to cite one instance, that Aldhelm and other Southumbrian poets found entirely different ways of dealing with elision and internal caesurae from those adopted by Bede and the Northumbrian poets. Such a demonstration will have important consequences. For example, the collection of forty enigmas by one Eusebius⁶⁴ is commonly attributed to an abbot of Wearmouth-Jarrow named Hwaetberht who (as we learn from Bede's commentary on Samuel) bore the cognomen Eusebius.⁶⁵ However, the metrical practices of the enigmast Eusebius differ so strikingly from those of Bede and the Northumbrian poets - while agreeing with those of Southumbrian poets - that this Eusebius is almost certainly a Southumbrian; he is not, therefore, identical with Hwaetberht of Wearmouth-Jarrow. And such a conclusion would square better with what other evidence we have: all other known authors of collections of enigmas (Aldhelm, Tatwine, and Boniface) were Southumbrian.⁶⁶ One further example: in *ss* V.8 Bede has occasion to quote eight elegiac verses from the epitaph of Archbishop Theodore. Once again the metre of these verses is strikingly Southumbrian. Furthermore, the epitaph is stuffed with phrases which recur frequently in Aldhelm's poetry: *lingue pelagae, consortis uitae, ciuiibus angelicis*, etc. I would suggest that the author of Theodore's epitaph was Aldhelm himself, though such suggestions should best wait until Neil Wright's comprehensive study of Anglo-Latin metrical practice has been published.

I have dwelled at length on Southumbrian Anglo-Latin writers because, in general, the Latin culture of late seventh and early eighth century Northumbria has been more thoroughly studied, is better understood, and consequently presents fewer urgent scholarly problems. The most lavish Northumbrian manuscripts have been studied in detail and have been (or are being) edited in facsimile.⁶⁷ Above all, the edition of the works of Bede in the series *Corpus Christianorum* proceeds apace. As one might expect, the quality of these editions is variable;⁶⁸ those done by C. W. Jones excel in their comprehensive knowledge of manuscripts and their conscientious accuracy in establishing Bede's sources.⁶⁹ But the day is not too far distant when we will be able to read Bede's works in modern editions and not be obliged to rely on the often deplorable editorial work of Giles and Horwag.⁷¹ This state of fairly satisfactory affairs regarding Bede is perhaps

reflected in the fact that a recent symposium to mark the thirteenth centenary of Bede's birth could devote so much of its time to peripheral matters.⁷²

With Alcuin in the late eighth century a different situation obtains. Some of Alcuin's writings are available in sound editions - notably the poems and letters, edited by Dümmler for the MGH a century ago.⁷³ Even Dümmler's work may be in need of some revision: in recent studies of the manuscript tradition of Alcuin's poem on York, Peter Godman has been able to demonstrate that several previously unidentified manuscript sources lie behind the transcripts of the poem used by seventeenth-century antiquaries such as Roinart and Gale, and these discoveries may well necessitate a new edition of this, Alcuin's best-known, poem.⁷⁴ For the majority of Alcuin's writings, however, there is no more recent edition than that of Forster Proben (1777), which was reprinted in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vols. 100-101. Most of Alcuin's vast corpus of Latin writing is therefore urgently in need of re-edition, but, because of its immensity, the task is a formidable one. It will be alleviated somewhat when the census of Alcuin manuscripts, currently being prepared by Donald Bullough and David Ganz, has been published (its publication should put the study of Alcuin on the same secure footing which the publication of Laistner's handlist of Bede manuscripts put the study and edition of Bede after 1943). Many of the works printed by Proben can no longer be attributed to Alcuin,⁷⁵ and further work is needed on the canon of his writings.⁷⁶ To mention two examples: the early *Vita S. Iudoci* has been tentatively claimed for Alcuin,⁷⁷ but to my knowledge no one has ever seriously examined this claim, nor investigated Alcuin's hagiographical writings as a whole; and a vast florilegium preserved in the tenth-century manuscript Bamberg B.11.10 and compiled at Alcuin's instigation is certainly by Alcuin. This florilegium⁷⁸ contains excerpts from scripture (Books 1 and 2), from patristic writings (Book 3), and various antiphons, litanies, hymns and excerpts from Christian Latin poets (Book 4) such as Caesarius, Sedulius, Juvenius, Arator, Prosper, Dracontius, Venantius Fortunatus, Aldhelm, and Bede. When printed, this florilegium will illuminate many aspects of Alcuin's work, and will give a sound index to what Christian writings and sentiments he considered most important as well as some hint of what versions of the various texts (biblical, patristic, etc.) were available to Alcuin (at York!) in the late eighth century. In short, although several aspects of Alcuin's activity have been

studied his contribution to liturgical reform,⁷⁹ his anti-heretical writings,⁸⁰ his work as biblical scholar⁸¹ - it is too early to form an overall estimate of this indefatigable Anglo-Saxon scholar.⁸²

Alcuin's impact on Charlemagne and on Carolingian education has frequently been emphasized, but much less is known about his influence on students and followers who remained behind in York, which is the particular concern of students of Anglo-Latin literature.⁸³ I would draw attention to several works. First, a metrical calendar which, according to Wilmart,⁸⁴ was composed at York ca. 800. It is relevant to Alcuin because it is the earliest calendar to commemorate the feast of All Saints on 1 November, a feast which Alcuin was active in popularizing on the continent. Second, the *Miracula Hyniae*,⁸⁵ a poem of some five hundred lines which was sent to Alcuin *per fideles nostros discipulos, Eboracensis ecclesiae scolasticos*⁸⁶ and which is preserved uniquely in the aforementioned manuscript from Bamberg; the poem was arguably written at York.⁸⁷ Thirdly, the poem *De Abbatibus*⁸⁸ by one Aethilwulf, an account of the lives of the abbots of an unidentified monastic cell of Lindisfarne. We do not know where in Northumbria Aethilwulf wrote his poem, but it shares a number of phrases with the *Miracula Hyniae*, and both its structure and its diction are modelled on Alcuin's much longer poem on the church of York; I suspect that *De Abbatibus* was not written too far from York. Finally, there are the so-called "York Annals," a series of entries for the years 732-802, which are buried in the *Historia Regum* attributed to the early twelfth-century precentor at Durham, Symeon.⁸⁹ These "York Annals" bear a striking relationship to some of the entries in Alcuin's poem on York (e.g. the annals mention the deaths of two anchorites named Balthere and Eche - who are otherwise known only from Alcuin's poem). In the latter years of the eighth century, the annals focus on the affairs of Charlemagne, and it is hard not to believe that the annalist(s) derived much information directly from Alcuin. Significantly, the annals come at about the time of Alcuin's death in 804. And shortly thereafter, the record of Latin culture in Northumbria comes to an end.⁹⁰

The ninth is the darkest century in the record of Latin culture in England. At its very beginning, there are the few writings I have just mentioned; at its very end - the last decade - there is the literary activity in Wessex centred on Alfred: but in between the record is virtually blank, except for a small number of Latin diplomas. The Vikings are blamed for this extermination of Latin culture, and

rightly so, no doubt. But it should not be forgotten that Alfred was able to find a number of learned men in Mercia near the end of the century,⁹¹ which allows the supposition that (in western Mercia at least) the study of Latin had continued. It is simply that those responsible for its continuation left no writings of their own, in Latin, which have come down to us.⁹² For that reason our attention is thrown back on the ninth-century diplomas I have mentioned.⁹³ These diplomas have their own interesting story to tell about Latin culture in the ninth century. Nicholas Brooks⁹⁴ recently drew attention to a series of original Latin charters which were written at Christ Church in the 850's and 860's, and in particular, to the occurrence of one scribe whose documents span the years 855 to 873, and who was apparently the principal scribe - and by 873 the only scribe - of the archiepiscopal writing office. His latest charter⁹⁵ is replete with grammatical errors, repetitions and omissions, which suggest that he was no longer able to see what he had written. That no trained and literate scribe could be found in Cantabury to replace this aging blind man testifies to the sad state of learning at the time, and provides an interesting confirmation of Alfred's statement that he could not find a single literate man south of the Thames when he acceded to the throne (in 871).⁹⁶

For this period, then, as throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, Latin charters are a valuable index to the state of literacy which obtained at a given place and time, and it is much to be regretted that they are not more frequently consulted by students of Anglo-Latin literature. There are good reasons for their neglect, of course: they are for the most part available only in inadequate nineteenth-century editions, and, more importantly, a formidable amount of expertise is needed to distinguish (say) a genuine ninth-century charter preserved in a fourteenth-century cartulary from a charter forged in the twelfth century from ninth-century models - a situation which is exacerbated by the lack of any handbook whatsoever to the problems of Anglo-Saxon diplomatic.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, the British Academy is sponsoring the re-edition of all surviving Anglo-Saxon charters and, when all volumes have been published, they will be an indispensable tool to students of Latin culture. Two volumes have so far appeared.⁹⁸ These are edited in a form more useful to historians - who are more likely to be interested in the exact location of the boundary of an estate - than philologists, who are more likely to be interested in the exact wording

of an obscure word in the (almost invariably) verbose poem. Some rapprochement between philologists and historians is desirable in these matters. The most recent volume is provided with a glossary of difficult Latin words in the charters, and future volumes are to follow this format. In any case, the Anglo-Saxon diplomat are richly deserving of attention from students of Anglo-Latinity; such attention would, in turn, be of considerable benefit to historians.

In the period before the tenth century, the narrow sea of Anglo-Latin literature has been moderately well charted. With the tenth century, the scholar active today is faced with a vast expanse of relatively uncharted ocean. The task of charting this ocean lies ahead, and it is no mean task, for a variety of reasons. From the middle of the century onwards, largely from the impetus of the Benedictine reformers, scriptoria in various English monastic centres became very active, with the result that, even today, hundreds of manuscripts written in England between (say) 950 and 1025 survive; many of these have yet to be identified, and the majority has yet to be adequately described and catalogued. The situation is compounded by the fact that, from the beginning of the tenth century onwards, large numbers of manuscripts were imported into England from the continent; and these too remain to be identified, described, and catalogued.⁹⁹ The result is that the contents of a majority of the manuscripts which were available in late Anglo-Saxon monastic libraries are improperly known. Until they are better known, any account of Latin culture in tenth-century England must be superficial. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that many Anglo-Latin writings in these manuscripts await discovery. The identification of poetic texts in manuscript will be immensely facilitated by Schaller and Kluge's new and indispensable *incipitarius* of pre-1100 poems;¹⁰⁰ for prose texts one proceeds by trial and error.¹⁰¹ At any rate, it will be many years before we can speak with confidence about the resources of tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature.¹⁰²

The question is greatly complicated by the problem of continental influence on tenth-century English intellectual life. A few years ago Donald Bullough remarked that "'England and the Continent in the Tenth Century' is one of the unwritten works of early medieval historiography."¹⁰³ It cannot yet be written. I have mentioned the large numbers of manuscripts imported into England in the tenth century awaiting study. Equally important, and equally in need of

study, are the continental schools and libraries which exerted the greatest influence on English scholars at that time: St. Peter's in Ghent, Corbie, and Fleury. Until these centres have been more thoroughly studied, it will not be possible to estimate the impact a sojourn at one of them may have had on an Anglo-Saxon monk, or what books and ideas a scholar from one of them might have imported to England. What is needed for each of them is a study along the lines of John Contreni's recent and excellent book on the ninth-century cathedral school at Leão.¹⁰⁴ For Fleury alone, this task would be enormous. Some five hundred manuscripts (perhaps a conservative estimate) survive which were written at or were in the possession of Fleury before ca. 1100, and which are largely preserved in five libraries (Orléans, the Vatican, Bern, Leiden, and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris). A tiny percentage of these has been adequately catalogued. Yet if one wishes to ask the question: what books might Oswald or Osgar have read during their sojourns at Fleury, it is too soon to expect an answer. Similarly, to the question, what books might Lantfred (who may possibly have come from Fleury) or Abbo have brought with them to England, and what books would they have taught, there is as yet no answer. Before these questions can be answered, the surviving books from Fleury will need to be catalogued and studied,¹⁰⁵ for without a knowledge of the tenth-century library at Fleury, it is impossible to understand the dynamics of late Anglo-Saxon literary culture.

The above point may be illustrated by a small example. Several years ago, while editing a curious poem¹⁰⁶ in hexameters - beginning *Flagnum, apoplexis, rema, liturgia, spasmus*, continuing with ten more lines of similar Greek disease, and ending with the admonition *trivocinare* ("sort it out for yourself!") - which is preserved in a mid-eleventh-century manuscript written at St. Augustine's Canterbury now in Cambridge (University Library, MS Cg. 5.35), a poem which is evidently confected from a glossary of Greek medical terms, I identified two surviving manuscripts of the glossary in question, and then raised the question as to whether one or other of them might be English.¹⁰⁷ I have subsequently studied the two manuscripts in question. Neither is English. One (and probably the other as well) is from Fleury. The one which is certainly from Fleury (Dum., Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Benjaminus Lat. 1160) contains, in addition to the medical glossary, a text of the *Geographica* of

Aethicus Ister On the basis of several trial collations, I think it is very probable that this manuscript was the exemplar (possibly *v. a.* an intermediary) of another manuscript of Aethicus: Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Scaligeranus 69 - a manuscript which, as T.A.M. Bishop demonstrated,¹⁰⁸ was written at St. Augustine's in the second half of the tenth century. And concerning the poem itself: I have subsequently found another copy of it in a manuscript which was written at Salzburg in the mid-ninth century but which was at Fleury in the late tenth century, when the poem was copied on to the last page of the manuscript, Orléans, bibl. mun. 184(161). The poem, then, is not, as I thought it was, an Anglo-Latin production, but was most probably composed at Fleury where the glossary which provided its vocabulary was found in one (and possibly another) copy. But if we ask the questions: how was it transmitted to Canterbury, and why was it copied into Gg.5.35, then it loses none of its interest for students of Anglo-Latin. It is one minor strand in the broadloom of influence between England and the continent in the tenth century.¹⁰⁹

With these general remarks in mind, I shall proceed to discuss the three monastic houses of late Anglo-Saxon England which contributed most to Anglo-Latin literature: Christ Church, Canterbury; the Old Minster, Winchester; and Ramsey. For the study of Christ Church there are three primary texts which require scholarly attention. Frithegod's *Areuolquium Vitae Wilfredi* (written 948-958) has been printed several times¹¹⁰ but has not yet been adequately edited. The *Vita S. Dunstani* (written 995-1005) by the Englishman .B.¹¹¹ also needs to be edited anew with respect to the two surviving manuscripts as well as the slightly later abbreviation of it which was made for Abbo of Fleury. Above all, the collection of correspondence which was probably compiled at Christ Church during the decade 990-1000 and of which a copy survives in the first part of London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.xv, needs careful study. Stubbs edited this collection over a hundred years ago,¹¹² but his edition (though indispensable) is not accurate, and badly needs redning. When accurate editions of these three primary texts are available; when full account has been taken of T.A.M. Bishop's painstaking researches on Christ Church manuscripts;¹¹³ and when Nicholas Brooks' forthcoming account of pre-Conquest Christ Church has been published,¹¹⁴ we shall be in a stronger position to estimate the intellectual contribution of this monastery which, inasmuch as it housed Oda and Dunstan at various times, can never have been negligible.

A somewhat more favourable situation obtains with respect to the Old Minster at Winchester.¹¹⁵ Here some of the essential texts are available for study in sound editions - notably, for example, Don Thomas Symons' edition of Aethelwold's *Regularis Concordia*¹¹⁶ - but many more, if they have been edited at all, are presently available only in partial or out-of-the-way editions: I would mention the *Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni* of Lantfred,¹¹⁷ or Aelfric's abbreviation of the *Regularis Concordia* which he made for his monks at Eynham.¹¹⁸ I hope that the situation at Winchester will be somewhat repaired - at least for texts relative to the cult of St. Swithun - by the imminent publication of *The Cult of St. Swithun*, which I have prepared as vol. IV, pt. 2 of *Winchester Studies* (under the general editorship of Martin Biddle).¹¹⁹ The volume contains new editions (with translation and full commentary) of Lantfred's *Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni*, Wulfstan the Cantor's *Marrieda Metrice de S. Swithuno* (a hexametrical version of Lantfred's text), an epitome of Lantfred's text which I would attribute to Aelfric, as well as a number of shorter, previously unpublished Latin poems on St. Swithun. Other texts, such as Aelfric's Eynham customary mentioned above, or Wulfstan's *Vita S. Aethelwoldi*,¹²⁰ still require attention. Nevertheless, this textual work, when combined with the important work of scholars in ancillary disciplines - that of Helmut Grosse and his pupils on the Winchester origins of standard Old English,¹²¹ the Biddles' forthcoming account of their excavation of the Old Minster,¹²² Robert Doornik's forthcoming study of the Benedictional of St. Aethelwold, and Alexander Planchart's recent and excellent study of the Winchester trope repertory¹²³ - will soon allow a more comprehensive assessment of tenth-century Winchester than has hitherto been possible.

It is at Ramsey, however, where work in progress is most likely to effect a thorough-going reassessment of the picture which was current as recently as a decade ago. In 986, one of the most learned men in the Europe of his day, Abbo of Fleury, came at the invitation of Oswald and Dunstan to Ramsey, where he spent nearly two years instructing the English monks in a variety of subjects. The enormous impact of Abbo's teaching - in England as well as on the continent - has never been adequately appreciated; indeed, it is a pity that no satisfactory full-length study has ever been devoted to Abbo.¹²⁴ His influence on English learning is visible from several vineyards: his polished *Pessio S. Bedae*, which was immediately influential on

subsequent English hagiography,¹²⁵ his grammatical instruction, as purveyed by his so-called *Quaestiones Grammaticales*,¹²⁶ which were sent to the monks of Ramsey when Abbo had returned to Fleury, his computational learning as revealed in numerous surviving English manuscripts,¹²⁷ and his English student at Ramsey, Byrhtferth. Until recently, Byrhtferth was known solely as the author of a handbook to computational studies, partly in Latin, partly in Old English.¹²⁸ During the past decade, work by various scholars has greatly enlarged the canon of Byrhtferth's writings in Latin and Old English, to the point where he may eventually emerge as one of the most prolific authors of the late Anglo-Saxon period. To begin with, C. R. Hart demonstrated that the contents of a late eleventh-century manuscript in Oxford (St. John's College, MS 17), a vast compendium of computational materials, were intimately connected with similar materials in Byrhtferth's handbook (for *Enchiridion*, as Byrhtferth himself called it); Hart suggested that the St. John's manuscript was a copy of a (lost) manuscript assembled by Byrhtferth himself.¹²⁹ Peter Beher, in a forthcoming article, has demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that the *Enchiridion* was in fact intended by Byrhtferth as a sort of commentary on materials which has been assembled in the lost exemplar of St. John's 17.¹³⁰ Now St. John's 17 is a fascinating manuscript, and deserves close attention (indeed, it ought to be published entire, preferably in facsimile). It contains an introduction (epilogue) by Byrhtferth,¹³¹ a calendar, computational notes and diagrams by Abbo of Fleury, copies of Bede's *De Temporibus*, *De Temporibus Ratione* and *De Natura Rerum*, Haveleric's *Liber de Computo*, and a good deal of miscellaneous grammatical and medical material; there are marginal glosses throughout, many of which are demonstrably Byrhtferth's (and, as such, deserve publication). Even setting aside the computational materials (which are not to every scholar's taste), there is much in this manuscript to interest students of Anglo-Latinity. One item has particular interest. Against various dates in the above mentioned calendar (found on ff. 16-21) are some hexameters: the relics of a metrical calendar. On closer inspection it is clear that the basis of this Ramsey calendar was the earlier metrical calendar which I mentioned in connection with York (which had been compiled there ca. 800, and which venerated many local York saints). In the Ramsey calendar, the York saints have been suppressed, and replaced with a number of northern Frankish saints, in particular, those venerated at and near Fleury; there are also several saints venerated

in late tenth-century England: St. Oswald of Worcester, St. Knecht of Winchcombe, St. Edmund of East Anglia (whose passio was first composed by Abbo during his stay at Ramsey). I would be inclined to distinguish three phases in the development of this metrical calendar from Ramsey: (1) the original version written at York, ca. 800, (2) its transmission to northern Francia and eventually Fleury, where the local English saints were expunged and replaced with Frankish ones; and (3) transmission once again to England - possibly through the agency of Abbo himself - where local English saints were once again added, this time those who were currently being venerated at Ramsey. At this remove the authorship of the Ramsey calendar cannot be determined, but it is natural to think of one (or more) of the literary figures who were active at Ramsey in the late tenth century: Abbo, Byrhtferth, or Oswald the Younger. In any case, the Ramsey calendar, when printed, will provide one more link between England and the continent in the tenth century, and one more specimen of Anglo-Latin verse.¹³²

While Hart and Baker have been working with Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*, I have been studying his Latin style. As I hope to have demonstrated, Byrhtferth writes Latin in an absolutely unmistakable way, and the imprint of his authorship can be recognized wherever it occurs. Recognition of this unmistakable style has led me to attribute to Byrhtferth three substantial Latin works: the *Vita S. Oswaldi* and the *Vita S. Ecgwini* (both preserved side by side in London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero E.1, vol. 1¹³³), and, more recently, the early sections (five in number) of the *Historia Regum* which passes under the name of Symeon of Durham.¹³⁴ The identification of Byrhtferth's authorship of these works is a strong argument in favour of their re-edition: I have prepared editions of the *Vita S. Oswaldi* and *Vita S. Ecgwini*, while David Dumville is at work on an edition of the *Historia Regum*. When these editions are available, the study of Byrhtferth's peculiar Latinity will be placed on a secure footing. But Byrhtferth commands attention in other respects. He was very proud of his quite remarkable learning, and found countless occasions to quote from books he had read. By studying Byrhtferth's Latin writings together with the *Enchiridion* and St. John's 17, we will be able to form an accurate estimate of the contents of the library at Ramsey in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries - a fact which assumes the greater significance in that very few surviving books are known to have been written at Ramsey, and no recognizable script has yet been

associated with it (Ramsay does not figure at all in T.A.M. Bishop's *English Caroline Manuscripts*). Like most Anglo-Saxon scholars, Byrhtferth was able to quote from a wide range of late Latin and Christian Latin poets (notably the *Disticha Catonis*, Prosper, Prudentius, Caecilius Sedulius, and Arator). He knew Aldhelm apparently by heart.¹³⁵ He seems to have possessed a fairly complete set of Bede's historical writings (it may even be possible to identify the manuscript of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* from which he quotes¹³⁶), and has lengthy citations of Bede's poem *De Die Iudicii* of cardinal importance in understanding the textual transmission of that work.¹³⁷ Equally significant is Byrhtferth's familiarity with philosophical texts. He quotes from Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, particularly the *metra*, at many points.¹³⁸ He appears to have been the first Englishman to know Macrobius' commentary *In Somnium Scipionis*, and there is some evidence to suggest that it was Abbo who brought the work to England.¹³⁹ At any event, before any overall assessment of the Anglo-Saxon school curriculum can be made, the Latin writings of Byrhtferth will require scholarly attention.

I have concentrated on Christ Church (Canterbury), the Old Minster (Winchester), and Ramsey because it seems to me that intellectual life was most vigorous in these three monastic houses; to them, at least, we can attribute surviving Latin texts. There are numerous texts of primary importance which cannot easily be attributed to a particular centre. Three sorts of text may be signalled: Latin glossaries, colloquies, and saints' lives. For the early period (before 900), the principal Latin-Old English glossaries have been carefully edited - in large measure because they have attracted the attention of Old English philologists.¹⁴⁰ For the later period, there are numerous Latin-Latin glossaries and glossae collectae preserved in pre-Conquest Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, and these, by and large, have never been printed or studied.¹⁴¹ Until they have all been printed, it is impossible to gain an adequate understanding of the sources of obscure or hermeneutic vocabulary which was employed by Anglo-Latin authors of the later period. The scholastic colloquy was a form frequently used by Anglo-Latin authors, both for elementary instruction and as a vehicle for the ostentation of learned vocabulary; although the most important Anglo-Latin colloquies have been printed,¹⁴² their sources and diffusion are not yet properly understood.¹⁴³ There are also numerous anonymous saints' lives from the late Anglo-Saxon period which have been

neglected by students of Anglo-Saxon culture for the apparent reason that they are available only in unsatisfactory editions over a century old: I would mention the *Historia de S. Guthberto*,¹⁴⁴ the *Vita S. Sumwoldi*,¹⁴⁵ and the *Vita S. Aethi*.¹⁴⁶ Other examples of Anglo-Latin hagiography remain unpublished.

I began my discussion of tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature by pointing to pre-Conquest manuscripts as yet inadequately catalogued, and suggested that many unknown works will eventually come to light. Furthermore, the Anglo-Latin scholar cannot lazily accept 1066 as the terminus of his manuscript researches, for there is the very real possibility that works of the pre-Conquest period are to be found in manuscripts copied a century or more after the Conquest. This point may be illustrated by one brief example. A manuscript in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, Digby 112, which was apparently written at Winchester in the very early twelfth century, contains several works of interest to the Anglo-Latin scholar: an unprinted vita of St. Birinus, the apostle of Wessex, which could prove on examination to have been written at about the time of the Conquest,¹⁴⁷ an unprinted Latin translation of a lost Old English vita of the Irish martyr St. Indract who was venerated at Glastonbury,¹⁴⁸ and a recension of a vita of St. Egwine of Evesham composed not long after the Conquest.¹⁴⁹ Perhaps the most fascinating text in the manuscript is a Latin translation of a (lost) Greek work describing the churches and shrines of eleventh-century Constantinople. The recent editor of the Latin text, Krijnia Ciggeer,¹⁵⁰ has demonstrated that the translation was made in England at the time of the Conquest or very soon thereafter; it thus provides an important witness to the study of Greek in Anglo-Saxon England and another link in the chain of Anglo-Byzantine relations which have exercised historians of the period.¹⁵¹ Digby 112 is a small manuscript, but its treasures are great; other post-Conquest manuscripts may hold similar treasures. No doubt a law of diminishing returns will operate as the quest for pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin writings is extended later and later into mediæval manuscripts; but it cannot therefore be abandoned. And, finally, one ought as a matter of habit to become familiar with the writings of the sixteenth-century antiquaries:¹⁵² they had access to the manuscript holdings of English monasteries before the Dissolution, and consequently may have seen and recorded details of manuscripts which have subsequently been lost or destroyed. John Leland in particular had an indelible knowledge of manuscripts.

in monastic libraries, and the four crammed volumes of transcriptions in his own hand, called the *Collectanea*,¹⁵³ are richly deserving of study and frequently yield Anglo-Latin texts which have previously been unknown.¹⁵⁴ I never quite despair of one day finding, during a chance consultation of a manuscript, the lost works of Oswald the Younger of Ramsey, Byrhtferth's contemporary, whose writings Leland described as fully and praised so fulsomely.¹⁵⁵

The task facing the Anglo-Latin scholar today is enormous, but not, perhaps, insuperable. We will increasingly have the benefit of a number of scholarly enterprises now in progress. Helmut Gneuss has undertaken the difficult but absolutely fundamental task of compiling a preliminary list of pre-Conquest manuscripts of English origin or provenance.¹⁵⁶ It is intended that the preliminary list will eventually be followed by a catalogue describing the contents of all the manuscripts in question; in the time between the publication of the preliminary list and the catalogue, scholars working actively in the field of Anglo-Latin studies must assume the responsibility of sending to Gneuss all pertinent information to Anglo-Saxon manuscripts with which they are familiar. In order that facsimile editions of the most important insular manuscripts may be made easily and inexpensively available, a Cambridge publisher has undertaken to publish facsimile volumes of manuscripts in microfiche. An initial series of some ten manuscripts in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, is being planned under the general editorship of Raymond Page. Another indispensable tool to research in this field is the British Academy's *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, of which one fascicle (A-B) appeared in 1975, with another (C) scheduled for publication in 1981. The first fascicle did not give the coverage one might have wished to pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin texts, particularly to the most obscure words which are found in these texts. But the new editor of the dictionary, David Nowlett, is a scholar active in the field of Anglo-Latin¹⁵⁷ and well-versed in the problems which Anglo-Latin texts present. One can anticipate that future fascicles prepared under his direction will become increasingly useful for study of the pre-Conquest period. The publication of the *Toronto Old English Dictionary* will also be an indispensable tool, since so many words in the Old English lexicon are attested as glosses to words in Latin texts, and knowledge of the Old English equivalents will help in interpreting Latin lemmata, particularly the most difficult ones. Finally, it is essential for the

problems characteristic of Anglo-Latin studies to become better known. In this respect, the editors of *Toronto Medieval Latin Texts* have rendered a great service in publishing two fine editions of Anglo-Latin texts: Michael Winterbottom's edition of three tenth-century saints' lives, Colin Chase's of two collections of Alcuin letters assembled by Archbishop Wulfstan.¹⁵⁸ By using texts such as these, undergraduate and graduate students will become familiar with the problems and peculiarities of Anglo-Latin at an early stage of their work. If the subject is to progress and flourish, their active participation is essential.

NOTES

¹ *Venerabilis Bedae Opera Historica*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1896; most recent reprinting 1969). The more recent edition of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* by B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), takes account of the early Leningrad manuscript of Bede which Plummer had not seen and which affects a handful of readings in the text, but Colgrave's annotation is skeletal compared with Plummer's (on which it is largely based), and Mynors' account of the manuscript tradition, too, is based on Plummer - a debt which Mynors generously acknowledges. Furthermore, Plummer's volume includes editions of Bede's *Historia Abbatum* and the anonymous *Vita S. Cuthberti*. There is a memoir of Plummer in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* 15 (1929): 463-76; and see the fine essay by J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, "Bede and Plummer," in *Fasculus Christi*, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 366-85.

² *Asser's Life of King Alfred* (Oxford, 1904; rev. in 1959 with an additional essay by D. Whitelock, "Recent Work on Asser's Life of Alfred").

³ A. S. Napier and W. H. Stevenson, *The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents* (Oxford, 1895). Shortly before his death in 1924, Stevenson was working on the edition of a number of Anglo-Latin colloquia (see n. 142 below), which were published posthumously by W. M. Lindsay. Although the posthumous edition is a valuable one, it lacks the detailed annotation which Stevenson would no doubt have wished to give it.

⁴ *The Corpus Glossary* (Cambridge, 1921); *The Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt and Leiden Glossaries* (Oxford, 1921). Lindsay also contributed the inspiration and an enormous amount of work to the *Glossaria Latina*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1928-31); although the glossaries printed in this edition are not Anglo-Latin, they are the bases of all later medieval Latin glossaries, and as such are fundamental to understanding the sources of the unpublished Latin-Latin glossaries of the pre-Conquest period (see n. 141 below).

⁵ 12 vols. and supplement (Oxford, 1934-71); a second edition of vol. 11 (Great Britain and Ireland) was published in 1972.

⁶ M. L. W. Laistner and W. B. King, *Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1943).

⁷ *Bede's Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Extractio* (Cambridge, Mass., 1939; rev. 1970). Some of Laistner's most important essays are reprinted in his *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages*, ed. C. G. Starr (New York, 1972). Laistner's cursory treatment of certain Anglo-Latin authors in his *Thought and Letters in*

Western Europe A.D. 500 to 900, rev. ed. (Ithaca, N.Y., 1957) is in many ways the most reliable introduction in English to the early period of Anglo-Latin.

⁸ *Beda's Opera de Temporibus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943); the texts contained in this volume have recently been reprinted - without Jones' lavish introduction and commentary - as *Beda's Opera Didascalica* 2, CCSL 123B (Turnhout, 1977). Jones of course (unlike the other scholars I mention here) is alive and still actively publishing in the field of Anglo-Latin studies; but I feel that his name should be associated with the great scholars of the earlier period *honoris causa*. See now *Saints, Scholars and Heroes: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honour of Charles W. Jones*, ed. M. M. King and W. M. Stevens, 2 vols., (Collegeville, Minn., 1979).

⁹ There is an excellent sketch of the development and achievements of the MGH project by Levison in *Wattenbach-Levison, Deutsche Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter I: Vorzeit und Karolinger* (Weimar, 1952), pp. 17-28.

¹⁰ Alcuin's poetry: in MGH, *Poetae Aevi Carolini Latini* 1 (Berlin, 1881): 160-351, Alcuin's letters. In MGH, *Epistolae* 4.2 (Berlin, 1895): 18-481.

¹¹ MGH, *Epistolae Selectae* 1: S. Bonifatii et Lullii Epistolae, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1955).

¹² MGH, *Auctores Antiquissimi* 13 (Berlin, 1919).

¹³ MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* 4.3 (Berlin, 1896): pp. 903-10, 943-62, etc.

¹⁴ MGH, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum Scholarum: Vita S. Bonifatii Archiepiscopi Moguntini* (Hannover/Leipzig, 1905, rev. 1977).

¹⁵ (Oxford, 1946, rev. most recently in 1973). There is also much of interest to the student of Anglo-Latin in Levison's collected papers, *Aus Rheinischer und Fränkischer Frühzeit: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. W. Holtmann (Düsseldorf, 1948); for a complete record of his writings, see Wilhelm Levison 1876-1947: A Bibliography (Oxford, 1948).

¹⁶ *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars* (New York, 1947); Alcuin, *Friend of Charlemagne* (New York, 1951); *St. Dunstan of Canterbury* (London, 1955), and *Alfred the Great and his England* (London, 1957).

¹⁷ Colgrave's editions include: *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid* by Eddius Stephanus (Cambridge, 1927); *Two Lives of St. Guthbert* (Cambridge, 1940); *Feilix's Life of St. Guthlac* (Cambridge, 1956); and *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1968). Perhaps the least dependable of these is the first, which should be not be consulted if a dependable copy of Levison's edition of the *Vita S. Wilfridi* (in MGH, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* 6 (Hannover/Leipzig, 1913): 163-363) is at hand.

¹⁸ Campbell's editions include: *Beowulf: Some Beginnings, London Third Series* 72 (London, 1949); *Prithipodi Monachi Hwylfingensis Vita* (London, 1949); *Wulfstan Cantuariensis Episcopi Sermones* (London, 1962); *Thesaurus Mundi* 1 (Zürich, 1950); *Chronicon Aethelwulfi* (London, 1962); and *Aethelwulf De Abbatibus* (Oxford, 1967). The quality of these

editions varies considerably: that of the *Encyclopaedia* is sound and provided with ample and helpful commentary; on the other hand, that of Pritagor - admittedly a fiercely difficult text - provides abundant evidence that Campbell could not begin to understand the text he was editing.

¹⁹ (Cambridge, Mass., 1967). Ogilvy's book will be used by every scholar in the field, often with gratitude, but it cannot be relied upon, particularly at places where Ogilvy cites manuscripts (he has evidently not consulted the manuscripts he cites and has not sought the advice of paleographers, with the result that his datings of manuscripts are often wildly inaccurate - some of those he cites as evidence for knowledge of a text in pre-Conquest England are as late as the fifteenth century - and their shelfmarks are often erroneously given).

²⁰ (Princeton, 1967). Bolton's attempt to provide a handbook for beginners and for scholars in ancillary disciplines (especially those working on Old English) is most commendable, and has the advantage of being provided with an ample, if indiscriminating, bibliography. The problem is that the book is not laid out in a way to help a beginner find the most reliable edition of a work and, amid the multifarious citations of occasional papers on Anglo-Latin authors by nineteenth-century country vicars, to find the most dependable discussions of that text; in other words, the bibliography needs to be more closely integrated with the discussion of each author, in the manner of Teuffel-Schwabe or Manitius. Furthermore, Bolton's book is infested with errors of every sort (especially errors of historical fact and of translation), and these are a serious drawback in a book intended for the non-specialist reader.

²¹ I would draw attention to two other accounts of the state of research in Anglo-Latin: W. F. Bolton, "Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin: Perspectives and Prospects," *Comparative Literature* 23 (1971): 151-66, and the brief but trenchant remarks by F. C. Robinson, "Anglo-Saxon Studies: Present State and Future Prospects," *Medievalia* 1 (1975): 62-77, who describes Anglo-Latin as "the real frontier in early English studies" (p. 72).

²² There is some discussion of these problems by P. F. Jones, "The Gregorian Mission and English Education," *Speculum* 3 (1928): 335-48.

²³ "Who Introduced Charters into England? The Case for Augustine," *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 3 (1963-9): 526-42, rep. in *Prize Monuments*, ed. F. Banger (London, 1973), 88-107; see also the earlier discussion by Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, pp. 174-233.

²⁴ Hadrian is the addressee of Aldhelm's Letter II (ed. Ewald, p. 478). There is an earlier study of A. S. Cook, "Hadrian of Africa, Italy and England," *Philological Quarterly* 2 (1923): 241-58. More recently, Professor Bischoff drew attention to the fact that Felix, the biographer of Julian of Toledo, mentioned among Julian's writings an *Epistola ad Adrianum Abbatem* (now lost), and this letter may conceivably have been addressed to Hadrian of Canterbury (see *Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 22 (1973): 299).

²⁵ Again, there is an earlier article by A. S. Cook, "Theodore of Tarsus and Gislebertus of Athens," *Philological Quarterly* 2 (1923): 1-25, but this now requires complete revision.

²⁶ B. Bischoff, "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Enzyklopädie im Frühmittelalter," *SR* 6 (1954), 189-281, rep. in Bischoff's *Mittelalterliche Studien*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966-7), 1: 205-73. This seminal article has been translated into English by C. O'Grady in *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution*, ed. W. McNamara (Dublin, 1976).

²⁷ "Lapidary Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England: Part I, The Background; the Old English Lapidary," *ASE* (1978): 9-60, esp. 24 and 54.

²⁸ U. Bulst, "Eine anglo-lateinische Uebersetzung aus dem Griechischen um 700," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 75 (1938): 105-11.

²⁹ E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford, 1918): 137-51.

³⁰ At one point in his treatise *De Padiu Regulis* (part of his longer *Epistola ad Acircium*), Aldhelm quotes two lines of Lucanus de *Orfeo* (ed. Ewald, p. 159). Lucan's poem *Orpheus* has not survived, and Aldhelm's quotation from it is one of the very few traces remaining (see W. Morel, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (Leipzig, 1917), pp. 128-9). It is striking that the author of the *Elber Monstrorum* mentioned below also knew Lucan's *Orpheus* and referred to it on three occasions (see Morel, p. 129). Other Latin poets known to and quoted by Aldhelm such as Juvenal and Claudian were not otherwise known in Anglo-Saxon England for several centuries.

³¹ Edition cited above, n. 12.

³² Aldhelm: *The Prose Works* (Cambridge, 1979).

³³ "Aldhelm's Prose Style and Its Origins," *ASE* 6 (1977): 39-76.

³⁴ "Une liste de mots communs à Gildas et à Aldhelm," *SC* 15 (1978): 353-67.

³⁵ "Les sources du vocabulaire d'Aldhelm," *ALMA* 41 (1979): 75-90.

³⁶ Aldhelm: *The Prose Works*, pp. 16-18.

³⁷ F. Unterkircher, *Sancti Bonifatii Epistolae. Codex Friburgensis 751 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Codices selecti phototypice impressi* 24 (Graz, 1971), p. 25.

³⁸ Ewald, ed. pp. 477-8; Warren trans., *Aldhelm: The Prose Works*, p. 153.

³⁹ See C. W. Jones, *Anglo-Saxon Pseudepigraphs* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1939), pp. 69-70.

⁵⁹ Boniface's *ars* was last edited in 1835 by Cardinal Mai. Work towards a new edition was undertaken by G. J. Gebauer, "Prolegomena to the *Ars Grammatica Bonifatii*" (diss. Chicago, 1940), but Gebauer's edition was never published. Since then, a fragment of the work - in a hand contemporary with Boniface's lifetime - has been discovered; see W. A. Eckhardt, "Das Kaufunger Fragment der Bonifatius-Grammatik," *Scriptorium* 23 (1969) 280-97. A new edition by B. Löffstedt (largely based on Gebauer's research) has recently appeared: *Bonifatii (Vynfretii) Ars Grammatica* CCSL 123B (Turnhout, 1980). M. B. Parke has recently made a convincing case for identifying the handwriting of Boniface in a number of early Anglo-Saxon manuscripts: "The Handwriting of St. Boniface: A Reassessment of the Problems," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 96 (1976): 161-79.

⁶⁰ *The Ars Bonifatii: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary on the Sources* (diss. Cambridge, 1978). The earlier treatment of Boniface's sources by Gebauer (as cited in n. 59) is inadequate for the needs of modern scholarship. There is also a useful study of Boniface's reading (in writings besides the *ars*) by H. Schilling, "Die Handbibliothek des Bonifatius," *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 4 (1961-3) 286-348.

⁶¹ Aldhelm's two treatises on metre (or perhaps they are one), the *De Metris* and the *De Pedum Regula*, are contained in his longer *Epistola ad Acircium* (ed. Elwald, pp. 77-96 and 150-204, respectively). Bede's *De Arte Metrica* is edited by C. B. Kendall in *Bede's Venerabilis Opera* 1: *Opera Didascalica*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnhout, 1975); pp. 59-171; see also the study by R. S. Palmer, "Bede as Textbook Writer: A Study of his *De Arte Metrica*," *Speculum* 34 (1959): 573-84. Boniface's metrical treatise *De Metris* at Cassarici was printed long ago by T. Galeford, *Scriptores Latini Rei Metricae* (Oxford, 1837), pp. 557-85, from a Wolfenbüttel manuscript, and partially by A. Wilmanns in *Rheinisches Museum* 23 (1868): 403-4, from Rome. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Palatinus Latinus 1753 (Lorsch, s.viii/ix). A new edition of this work is printed by Löffstedt (as cited in n. 59).

⁶² See my discussion in "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse," *Comparative Literature* 31 (1979): 209-31.

⁶³ As part of a doctoral dissertation entitled *The Anglo-Latin Hexameter: Theory and Practice c. 600-c. 800* (Cambridge, 1981). My cursory remarks are based on his exhaustive statistical analysis, but final assessment must await the publication of his results.

⁶⁴ Ed. F. Glorie, *Collectiones Aenigmatum* (as cited in n. 55), 1: 208-71.

⁶⁵ The conventional view and the evidence is put by Bolton, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature*, pp. 219-23.

⁶⁶ There is perhaps some possibility that Bede composed enigmas which have not survived; see my remarks in *SRN* 90 (1975): 803.

⁶⁷ Especially the Lindisfarne Gospels (*Evangelium Quattuor Codex Lindisfarneensis*, ed. T. D. Kendrick, T. J. Brown, et al., 2 vols. (Oxford/Lausanne, 1936-60)), the Book of Durrow (*Evangelium Quattuor Codex Durwensis*, ed. A. A. Luce, G. O. Simms, et al., 2 vols. (Oxford/Lausanne, 1960)), and the Book of Kells (*Evangelium Quattuor Codex Cennaniensis*, ed. E. H. Alton and P. Meyer, 3 vols. (Bern, 1950-1)). A facsimile edition of Durham A. II. 17 by T. J. Brown and C. B. Verey for the series *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* is in press; this series also contains as vol. 2 the *Leningrad Bede*, ed. O. Arngart (Copenhagen, 1952) and vol. 9 *The Moore Bede*, ed. F. Hunter Blair and R. A. B. Mynors (Copenhagen, 1959).

⁶⁸ See n. 17 above.

⁶⁹ Cf. the remarks by F. Meyvaert in *Famulus Christi* (as cited in n. 72 below), p. 63, n. 19.

⁷⁰ In *Genesis*, CCSL 118A (Turnhout, 1967); *Opera Didascalica* 1, CCSL 123A (Turnhout, 1975); and *Opera Didascalica* 2, CCSL 123B (Turnhout, 1977).

⁷¹ See B. Bischoff, "Zur kritik der Harzwagener Ausgabe von Bedes Werken," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens* 51 (1933), 171-6; rep. in his *Mittelalterliche Studien* 1: 112-7.

⁷² *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirtieth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. G. Souer (London, 1976). As far as I can see, the essays by Lucas, M. Cathin, Kirby, Benedikt, and Harrison have little, if anything to do with Bede; on the other hand, the volume contains two outstanding essays: "Bede the Scholar" by Paul Meyvaert (pp. 40-69), and "Bede's Place in Medieval Schools," by C. W. Jones (pp. 261-85).

⁷³ See n. 10 above. Dümmler's edition is based on that of Wettsteinbach, which in turn was based ultimately on Gale's *editio princeps*. Dümmler's merit lies in having assembled the corpus of Alcuin's poetry from various sources and having furnished it with a scholarly apparatus.

⁷⁴ P. J. Godman, "Mabillon, Rufinart, Gale et L'Honneste d'Alcuin," *Revue Mabillon* 59 (1978): 1-7; and idem, "The Tradition of Alcuin's Poem on York," *NJ* 15 (1980): 33-50. Godman has edited the York poem as part of a doctoral dissertation entitled *Alcuin's Poem on York and the Literature of his Times*, 2 vols. (diss. Cambridge, 1980).

⁷⁵ To cite one example: the *Officium per Perlan* (PL 101: 509-612) are certainly not by Alcuin; see A. Wilmet, "Le manuel de prière de Saint Jean Oualbert," *RSB* 48 (1936): 259-99, at 336, n. 2.

⁷⁶ Some aspects of Alcuin's literary estate have received an inordinate amount of attention. For example, advocacy for Alcuin as the author of the *Libri Carolini* has frequently been reiterated by L. Wallach (most recently in his book *Diplomatic Studies in Latin and Greek Documents from the Carolingian Age* [Ithaca, N.Y., 1977]), even though the persuasive arguments in favour of Theodulf's authorship put by A. Franzen in a number of studies (in *Speculum* 32 [1957]: 643-705, 46 [1965]: 203-89 and 46 [1971]: 597-612) appear to be irrefragable and

have been accepted by a majority of scholars, see the balanced assessment by F. Heyvaert, "The Authorship of the *Libri Carolini*: Observation-ment by a Recent Book," *RB* 89 (1979), 29-57. On the other hand, a Proponent by a Recent Book has been expended in denying Alcuin's authorship of good deal of effort has been expended in denying Alcuin's authorship of a poem ("O mea cella," no. 23 in *Müller's* edition) which is unmistakably his, for example, by M. L. Uhlfelder, "Classicism and Christianity in his Poetic Synthesis," *Latomus* 36 (1975): 224-31; see now P. J. Gorman, "Alcuin's Versus O Mea Cella," *SR* 3rd ser. 20 (1979): 555-83.

77 The vita is printed in J. Mahillon, *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, 9 vols. (Paris, 1668-1701), 2:565-71; on Alcuin's possible authorship, see J. Trier, *Der heilige Jodocus*, Germanistische Abhandlungen 36 (Breslau, 1924), pp. 15-16 and 35-42.

78 See R. Constantinescu, "Alcuin et les 'Libelli Precum' de l'époque carolingienne," *Revue d'histoire de la spiritualité* 50 (1974): 17-56. Professor Bullough has recently discovered another early manuscript of the Bamberg florilegium in the Escorial (MS B.iv.17) and is currently preparing an edition of this important work.

79 See G. Ellard, *Master Alcuin, Liturgist* (Chicago, 1956), together with the important review by C. Mohler in *Journal of Sociological History* 9 (1957): 222-8. More recent studies include: O. Heimig, "Aus der Werkstatt Alkuins," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1956): 341-57; C. Vogel, "La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne," in *Karl der Grosse*, ed. W. Braunfels, B. Bischoff, et al., 4 vols. (Düsseldorf, 1965), 2 (Das geistige Leben): 217-32; H. Kurr and J. Dohmann, "A la recherche du milieu d'Alcuin," *Spemwides Liturgicae* 82 (1968): 5-44; and E. Gamber, "Der fränkische Abhang am Gregorianum in Licht eines Fragments aus dem Anfang des 9. Jh.," *SR* 21 (1972-3): 267-89.

80 W. Hall, "Der Adaptionismus, Alkuin und Spanien," in *Karl der Grosse*, 2: 95-135; and *idem*, *Alkuinstudien 1: Zur Chronologie und Bedeutung des Adaptionismus* (Düsseldorf, 1970).

81 See E. K. Read, "A Preliminary Study of Alcuin's Bible," *Harvard Theological Review* 24 (1931): 323-9; F. L. Ganshof, "La révision de la Bible par Alcuin," *Bibliothèque de Humanisme et Renaissance* 9 (1947): 7-20; and the important work by Konrad Fischer: *Die Alkuin-Bibel* (Freiburg in Breisgau, 1957); "Bibeltext und Bibelreform unter Karl dem Grossen," in *Karl der Grosse*, 2: 156-216; and "Die Alkuin-Bibel" in *his* *Die Bibel von Martinus-Grandval*, *SL* Addit. MS 10436 (Bern, 1972), pp. 49-98.

82 In the meantime, the most satisfactory general account is still that by C. J. B. Ganshof, *Alcuin: His Life and Work* (Cambridge, 1904). In his Ford Lectures (delivered to the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1980): the publication of these lectures is imminent.

83 I hope to return to the question of Northumbrian culture after Alcuin's departure on another occasion.

84 A. Wilmart, "Un témoin anglo-saxon du calendrier métrique d'York," *SR* 46 (1934): 41-69.

85 For Stracher's edition of the poem, see above n. 13, as well as Stracher's "Zu den Quellen für das Leben des Heiligen Willen," *Neues*

Archiv 43 (1920-2): 1-26, and Levison's article, "An Eighth-Century Poem on St. Willen," *Antiquary* 14 (1940): 280-91. The poem has been translated by W. W. MacQueen, "Miracula Hymni Episcopi," *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 4th ser. 38 (1959-60): 21-57.

86 As Alcuin reports in a letter to the familia of Whithorn, ed. MGH, *Epistolae* 4, p. 431.

87 It is commonly believed that the poem was written at Whithorn in Galloway, and subsequently transmitted to Alcuin via York (St. Willen was the founder of Whithorn, and the poem speaks of Whithorn as *finibus nostris*). However, the poem is a hexameter version of a (lost) vita of St. Willen, which was most certainly composed at Whithorn; it is possible that the anonymous poet was merely following verbatim the wording of the prose vita in speaking of Whithorn as *finibus nostris*. Furthermore, the poem is drawn from a wide range of Christian Latin poets, which implies a library of some considerable size. We know from Alcuin's poem on York that such a library existed at York, but of one at Whithorn we know nothing. I suspect, therefore, that the poem was composed at York by Alcuin's former pupils, and sent on to him (for the correction it so badly needs?) as proof that studies had not lapsed since the master's departure.

88 Ed. A. Campbell (Oxford, 1967); see also the remarks by D. B. Howlett, "The Provenance, Date and Structure of *De Abbatibus*," *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 5th ser. 3 (1975): 121-30.

89 Ed. T. Arnold, *Symonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. *Holle Series* (London, 1885), 2: 31-46 (with interpolations which need to be discounted); on these "York Annals" see P. Hunter Blair, "Some Observations on the *Historia Regum* Attributed to Symeon of Durham," in *Celt and Saxon*, ed. W. K. Chadwick (Cambridge, 1964), pp. 63-118, esp. pp. 86-99, as well as my arguments for the attribution of the early sections of the *Historia Regum* (which incorporate the "York Annals") to Byrhtferth of Ramsey (as cited in n. 134 below). William Stubbs, I believe, was the first to suggest a connection between these "York Annals" and Alcuin (*Chronicon Epistolae Regum de Norwiche*, 4 vols., *Holle Series* (London, 1868-71), 1: x-xi.)

90 In the middle of the ninth century (ca. 849) Lupus of Ferrières could write to Abbot Aidaig of York, asking for copies of Jerome, Bede and Quinilian to be sent to him (MGH, *Epistolae* 6, p. 62). York fell to the Vikings in 866 and thereafter the record is silent. If anything is further to be learned of the last days of Northumbrian culture, it will be from the painstaking analysis of the very few surviving ninth-century Northumbrian manuscripts, such as Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 63.

91 See the general remarks of F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 1971), pp. 270-1.

92 A few writings in Old English, such as the poetry of Cynewulf and the *Old English Martyrology*, have been attributed to ninth-century Mercia.

112. Ed. Stubbs, *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, pp. 359-77, 380-90 and 396-404. C. Mohler has described this collection of correspondence as "the one major monument of scholarship from the period" (in *Tenth-Century Studies* [as cited in n. 155], p. 74).
113. Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts, Part VII The Early Minuscule of Christ Church, Canterbury, "Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society 3 5 (1963): 413-73, and *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971), *passim*.
114. *The Early History of Christ Church, Canterbury*, forthcoming in the series *Studies in the Early History of Britain* (Leicester U. P.)
115. On Winchester see now *Tenth-Century Studies*, ed. D. Parsons (Chichester, 1975), and in particular the studies by K. Symons, C. Mohler, M. Biddle, and J. J. G. Alexander. There is also an important recent study by D. J. Sheerin, "The Dedication of the Old Minster, Winchester, in 980," *AS* 88 (1978): 261-73.
116. Ed. T. Symons, *Regularis Concordia* (London, 1953).
117. This, perhaps the most important of the Winchester texts, must now be read by combining the text printed by E. P. Sauvage in *AS* 4 (1885): 367-410, with that printed earlier by Jean Pion in the *Actes Sanctuarum*, t. III, vol. 1 (Antwerp, 1719), pp. 331-7 (which is reprinted in Pl. 155, cols. 65-80). But these editions are based on incomplete and inferior manuscripts, and do not allow an adequate appreciation of Lantfred's work.
118. Aelfric referred to the work as *pauca de libro consuetudinum*; it is edited by M. Bateson in *Compositus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St. Swithun's Priory, Winchester*, ed. G. W. Kitchen (Winchester, 1892), pp. 173-98. It remains to be determined how exactly Aelfric's work is related to Aethelwold's *Regularis Concordia*, and how deeply it is indebted *inter alia* to the *Liber Officialis* of Amalarius of Metz; cf. the remarks of M. McC. Gatch in *AS* 6 (1977): 240-1 and those of J. R. Hall, "Some Liturgical Notes on Aelfric's Letter to the Monks at Bynham," *Downside Review* 93 (1975): 297-303.
119. M. Lapidge, *The Cult of St. Swithun, Winchester Studies* 4.2 (Oxford, forthcoming).
120. There is a useful edition of this work by Michael Winterbottom (as cited in n. 158 below). However, the editorial principles of the series in which it appears (Toronto Medieval Latin Texts) require that the text be based primarily on one manuscript. Winterbottom chose London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius D. iv, vol. 2 with good reason, but even this text is deficient in places (e.g. at c. 11.17, p. 41, where this MS omits the name of the Winchester monk Frithgar who is named in other manuscripts of the work). A critical edition based on all surviving manuscripts, together with a commentary illustrating the Winchester cult of St. Aethelwold, is a serious desideratum.
121. K. Onnes, "The Origin of Standard Old English and Aethelwold's School at Winchester," *AS* 1 (1972): 63-83; see also the important studies by M. Gatch, *Die Regula Sancti Benedicti in England und ihre altenglische Übersetzung. Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen*

- Philologie 2 (Munich, 1973), and "Aethelwold's Translation of the *Regula Sancti Benedicti* and its Latin Exemplar," *AS* 3 (1974): 125-51.
122. M. Biddle and R. K. Blythe-Biddle, *The Anglo-Saxon Minsters of Winchester*, Winchester Studies 4.1 (Oxford, forthcoming).
123. A. E. Planchart, *The Repertory of Tropes at Winchester*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1977).
124. The monograph of P. Cousin, *Abbon de Fleury-sur-Aire* (Paris, 1954) is negligible, not much better is the discussion by C. E. Lutz, *School Masters of the Tenth Century* (Menden, Conn., 1977), pp. 41-52. Far and away the most important study of Abbo is the brilliant essay by A. van der Vyver, "Les oeuvres inédites d'Abbon de Fleury," *MS* 47 (1935): 125-69.
125. Ed. M. Winterbottom (as cited in n. 158 below), pp. 67-87. It is interesting to note that William of Malmesbury attributes to Aelfric an "abbreviatio Passionis S. Edmundi" (*Gesta Pontificum*, ed. W. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series [London, 1870], pp. 406-7), but I have been unable to identify such a work of Aelfric in any of the very numerous manuscripts containing *passiones* of St. Edmund. In any case, Aelfric also produced an Old English life of St. Edmund (based, no doubt, on that Abbo's *Passio* had reached an audience outside of Ramsey within a decade of its composition).
126. This work was first printed by Cardinal Mai, and then reprinted in Pl. 139, cols. 521-34; but this edition is so inaccurate as to be useless (cf. H. Bradley, "On the Text of Abbo of Fleury's *Quaestiones Grammaticales*," *PMA* 10 (1921-3): 173-80). A new edition has been prepared but not yet published: A. Guenrou-Jalabert, "Grammaire et culture profane à Fleury au Xe siècle: les *Quaestiones Grammaticales* d'Abbon de Fleury," *Scuola nazionale das chartes. positiones sua theses*.. de 1975 (Paris, 1975), 95-101.
127. See P. McCurk, "Computus *Heperici*: Its Transmission in England in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *MS* 43 (1974): 1-3. Three of the manuscripts in question deserve detailed study: Paris, BN lat. 7298 (s. x/xi), Cambridge, Trinity College B.15.32 (145) (Winchester, s.xi), and Oxford, St. John's College 17, on which see below.
128. Ed. S. J. Crawford, *Byrhtferth's Manual*, Early English Text Society (London, 1929).
129. "The Ramsey Computus," *MS* 65 (1970): 29-44; and *idem*, "Byrhtferth and his Manual," *MS* 41 (1972): 95-108.
130. S. Baker, "Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* and the Computus in Oxford, St. John's College, MS 17," *AS* 10 (1981), forthcoming. See also Baker's important study, "The Canon of Byrhtferth's Old English Writings," *Speculum* 55 (1980): 22-37, which is to some extent a refinement of some earlier suggestions by Peter Clemens, "The Composition of the Old English Text," in *The Old English Illustrated Gospels*, ed. P. Clemens and C. R. Dodwell, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 18 (Copenhagen, 1974), pp. 42-53.

132 See C. F. Worsley, "Byrhtferth's Preface," *Speculum* 3 (1928): 305-22.

132 It is edited in my "A Metrical Calendar from Ramsey," *RB*, forthcoming.

133 Byrhtferth and the *Vita* S. Ecgwini," *MS* 41 (1979), 331-53.

134 Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the Early Sections of the *Historia Regum* attributed to Symeon of Durham," *ASL* 10 (1981): forthcoming.

135 *Ibid.*

136 P. Hunter Blair observed ("Some Observations on the *Historia Regum*," as cited in n. 89 above, p. 91) that one of the extensive quotations from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* in the *Historia Regum* contains a reading now found in only one surviving manuscript of Bede's work, London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C.ii. It would be worthwhile examining this manuscript to see if it bears any indication of use by Byrhtferth.

137 See L. G. Whitbread, "After Bede: the Influence and Dissemination of his Doomeday Verities," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 204 (1967): 250-66, esp. 252-5. Whitbread's remarks will need to be revised in light of my arguments that the early sections of the *Historia Regum* were compiled by Byrhtferth; likewise, Whitbread was unaware of the extensive quotations from *De Dile Iudicii* in Byrhtferth's *Vita* S. Ecgwini.

138 Byrhtferth's extensive quotations of Boethius are an important witness to knowledge of the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* in late Anglo-Saxon England; another witness is the author of the poem *De Libro Arithmetice* which was composed at Winchester in the late tenth century (see *ASL* 1 (1972): 103-4). Numerous manuscripts of the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* survive which were written in England before the Conquest; many of these were provided with commentaries, which have been studied by D. E. Bolton, "The Study of the Consolation of Philosophy in Anglo-Saxon England," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 44 (1977): 33-78.

139 Byrhtferth quotes the *In Somnium Scipionis* in his *Enchiridion* (ed. Crawford, p. 16) and again in the Prologue to his *Vita* S. Oswaldi. The earliest manuscripts of this work of Macrobius to arrive in Anglo-Saxon England appear to have some connection with Abbo of Fleury; for could identify the hand of Abbo himself, and the aforementioned manuscript in Paris, MS lat. 7299 (n. 127).

140 The principal editions are the following: J. H. Neale, *An Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary* preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1870); *idem*, *A Late Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary* preserved in the Library of the Leiden University (Cambridge, 1906); W. M. Lindsay, *The Corpus Anglican Glossary* (the Hague, 1966); J. D. Philpot, *Old English Glosses in the Spinal-Erfurt Glossary* (Oxford, 1974). There is also the older edition of T. Wright, rev. R. F. Wulcher, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English*

Vocabularies, 2 vols. (London, 1884). Some of the glossaries in this last-mentioned work are badly in need of re-edition.

141 Latin-Latin glossaries in the following manuscripts may be mentioned: Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 47, London, British Library, Additional 32246; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 163, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 356, pt. 3; London, British Library, MS Royal 7.D.II and Harley 1826, as well as the English recensions of the *Hermeneumata Pa.-Dositheana* in Brussels, Bibl. Roy. 1828-30 and of the *Scholae Graecorum Glossarium* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 35 and London, British Library, MS Royal 15.A.XVI. There are countless Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which contain batches of glosses collected, and these too need attention. The task of editing these Latin-Latin glossaries is a formidable one and not to be undertaken lightly.

142 W. M. Stevenson, *Early Scholastic Colloquies* (Oxford, 1929).

143 There are two important studies: G. H. Gervase, "The Development of the Colloquy," in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. P. Clemoes (London, 1959), pp. 248-61; and W. Winterbottom, "On the *Hispanica Famula*," *Celtica* 8 (1967): 126-39.

144 Ed. T. Arnold, *Symonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1882-5), I: 196-214.

145 Ed. *Acta Sanctorum, Novembris*, vol. I, pp. 682-90.

146 Ed. J. Whitaker, *The Life of St. Neot, the Oldest of the Brothers of King Alfred* (London, 1809), pp. 339-65; cf. also G. C. Gorham, *The History and Antiquities of Wynebry and St. Neots in Huntingdonshire and of St. Neots in Cornwall* (London, 1820), pp. 251, 261-3 and 266-70. It hardly needs stressing that a text which has been ignored for over 150 years is now deserving of attention.

147 *Vita* S. Birini: Digby 112, ff. 5r-17r; this *vita* is listed in the *Bollandists' Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1898-1901), no 1361.

148 *Passio S. Indracti et sociorum eius*: Digby 112, ff. 99r-103r; listed in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* as no. 4271. I have discussed and edited this text in my study "The Cult of St. Indract at Glastonbury," in *Ireland in Early Medieval Europe: Studies in Memory of Kathleen Hughes*, ed. D. M. Dumville, R. McKitterick and D. Whitlock (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 179-212.

149 On this *vita* and on Digby 112 in general see my discussion "The Medieval Hagiography of St. Ecgwini," *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 6 (1977): 77-93, esp. 85-9; I have edited the *Society Research Papers* 7 (1979): 39-55. *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 7 (1979), 39-55.

150 K. M. Ciggar, "Une description de Constantinople traduite par un pèlerin anglais," *Revue des études byzantines* 34 (1976): 211-67.

151 See J. Shepard, "The English and Byzantium: A Study of their Role in the Byzantine Army in the Late Eleventh Century," *Traditio* 29 (1973): 53-92; C. B. Fall, "The Icelandic Saga of Edward the Confessor: Its Version of the Anglo-Saxon Emigration to Byzantium," *ASL* 3 (1974):

179-96; C. N. Cignani, "L'emigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066," *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974): 301-42; and for the earlier period, R. S. Lopez, "Le problème des relations Anglo-Byzantines du septième au dixième siècle," *Byzantion* 18 (1948): 139-62.

152 In general, see T. D. Kendrick, *Br.ish Antiquity* (London, 1954).

153 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Top. gen. c.1-4, they are edited by T. Hearne, *Joannis Lelandi Antiquarii De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (London, 1774). A new edition of Leland's *Collectanea*, identifying where possible the manuscripts from which he was copying and giving modern bibliography on each of the works in question, would be a very useful instrument of research. It is also worth noting that some detached fragments of Leland's *Collectanea* (not printed by Hearne) are preserved in London, BL Addit. MS 38132.

154 For example, Leland transcribed a number of epigrams from an apparently lost manuscript which had once belonged to Milred bishop of Worcester (nb. 775); I printed these epigrams in "Some Remnants of Bede's Lost *Liber Epigrammatum*," *ENS* 90 (1973), 798-820. At approximately the same time a single bifolium from a lost manuscript written in Anglo-Saxon square minuscule and dating from the first half of the tenth century came into the possession of the University Library at Urbana Illinois. This bifolium was found to contain a number of epigrams, and these were edited by L. Wallach, "The Urbana Anglo-Saxon Syllage of Latin Inscriptions," in *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance: Studies in Honour of James Hutton*, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 38 (Ithaca, N.Y., 1975), pp. 134-51; see also the corrections and additions to this edition by D. Schaller, "Zusatzungen zur Inschriften-Syllage von Urbana," *MJ* 12 (1977): 9-21. More recently, D. J. Sheerin has identified the hand of John Leland in the Urbana bifolium, thus raising the possibility that it is a fragment of the manuscript from which Leland copied the epigrams into his *Collectanea*: "John Leland and Milred of Worcester," *Manuscripts* 21 (1977): 172-80. But there are other treasures to be found in the *Collectanea*; see, for example, R. E. Buckalew, "Leland's Transcript of *Alfred's Glossary*," *ASJ* 7 (1978): 149-64.

155 J. Leland, *Commentarii de Scriptis Britannicis*, ed. A. Hall, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1709), I: 172: "...librum Sacrarum Præcationum partim carmine, partim soluta oratione continuit. Extat et eius de componendis epistolis opusculum, instat epistolæ, Tantum namque de componendis duos lucubrætiolum Orvaldi codices; unum Glossæburgi Somertrigum (i.e. Clatsbury), alterum Kamesægae Fencicolarum [i.e. Ramsey]. All these works have apparently perished.

156 Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Origin or Provenance: A Preliminary Hand-list," *ASJ* 9 (1980): 1-60.

157 See, for example, n. 88 above.

158 H. Winterbottom, *Three Lives of English Saints*, Toronto Medieval Latin Texts 1 (Toronto, 1972); C. Chase, *Two Alcuin Letter-Books*, Toronto Medieval Latin Texts 5 (Toronto, 1973).

SCIENTIFIC INSTRUCTION IN EARLY INSULAR SCHOOLS

Wesley M. Stevens

University of Winnipeg

The science to be discussed in this paper has to do with calculations and observations of both earth and skies. The evidence has not heretofore impressed modern philologists and historians who have searched for literary activities and their foundation in grammatica or who have scrutinized the patterns of prayer and psalms that one finds throughout European monasticism in the development of cantica. Yet the Celtic culture of striking images, fanciful word-plays, and astonishing holiness cannot be discussed very thoroughly without at least acknowledgment of a certain problem, like a thorn in the flesh: the date of Easter.¹ In Ireland, England, Spain, and Gaul during the entire seventh century, that problem demanded all available resources: reasoning arguments ensued, traditions were born, defended, or undermined. Some scholars, like Bede, considered that the question had been resolved by A. D. 664; but later writers, like Abbo of Fleury, knew that it had not.² From the fragmentary materials surviving from arithmetical calculations, geometrical models of heaven and earth, and arguments about solar and lunar cycles it is possible to recognize in computation not only occasional concerns but also concerted and significant scientific labours in the schools of the Scots of Ireland, Britons of Wales, Angles of Northumbria, Saxons of Southumbria and Wessex. If there were fanciful images they begin in grammatica; if there were prayers they were reinforced in cantica; but practical study of natural objects and the reckoning of relationships and motions of things were gathered together in computation.³ For science we look to the computus.

In the year A. D. 630 by our reckoning, a synod was held in Ireland at Campus Lemis (Magh Lén), and it was decided that beginning with the

Insular Latin Studies, ed. Michael Warren,
Papers in Medieval Studies 1 (Toronto:
 Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981)
 pp. 83-111

next year all should keep Easter with the universal church. It is not at all certain by what system this was to be achieved: whether it would be a simple table of dates; a sequence of memory verses, or a cycle of 8 or 19 or 76 or 84 or 95 or 112 years, with the saltus placed in the twelfth or the fourteenth or the sixteenth or the nineteenth year.

We know none of this. But we do know that there was serious objection to this decision and that someone brought about division among those who had agreed to celebrate Easter with the rest of the church. This objection seems to have led to a second synod a year later at Campus Albis (near Eliaze Mary, Queen's County). According to the *Vita S. Munni Sive Fintani* (d.636), the new *ordo Paschae* was defended there by Laisrén, abbot of Laignelme, under whom there were 1500 monks. But the old *computus* was defended by the holy Fintan, abbot of Tech Munnu (Teghmon, Co. Wexford), who kept the assembly waiting for a considerable time and finally made his entrance just before evening. Then he suggested how the Easter controversy could be settled:

There are three options, Laisrén:

Two books could be put in the fire, the old and the new, so that we may see which of them survives the fire;
or two monks, one of mine and one of yours, could be closed up in a hut and the hut could be set afire, and we should see which of them comes through the fire unhurt;
or we could go to the tomb of a just monk who has died and bring him back to life, and he will tell us by which *ordo* we should celebrate Easter this year.⁴

Laisrén discreetly refused the ordeal in any form on the grounds that Munnu's sanctity was so great that God would grant whatever he asked.

In the face of overwhelming business, Laisrén's decision was not an act of weakness, for the southern abbots were coming over to the new *ordo Paschalis*. Within only one century the northerners, British, and even the holy foundation of Columba on the island of Iona had abandoned the older *computus* "whose author or place or time we do not know," *cuiscus auctores locus tempus incertum habemus* (as Cummián said), in favour of an Alexandrian series of Easters, which appeared to be a true reckoning universally observed.

Rather than rehearsing the Paschal controversies of the seventh century, I want to discover how it came about that sanctity yielded to science among the Irish and British as well as among the Saxons and Angles. Cummián will lead us:

*Domini annetis et in Christo venerandis, Segieno abbati Columbae sancti et ceterorum sanctorum successorum, Beccanoque solitario, chato carne et spirita fratri, cum suis sapientibus; Cummiánus... (Epistola Cummiáni)*⁵

There are many Ségènes, Beccáns, and Cummiáns named in Irish annals and documents containing reports from the seventh century. This Ségène was abbot of Iona (A. D. 623-652), and this Beccán was presumably a relative of the author of the letter. Beyond this letter our author is scarcely known; this Cummián must have been living in a region from which prominent abbots would respond to his call for a synod at Mag Léna, a plain near Durrow.⁶ They came from

Emly (Co. Tipperary) where Ailbe had been bishop;
Clonsannois (Co. Offaly), founded by Clarné;
Birr (Co. Offaly), the place of Brendan;
Mungret (Co. Limerick) where Messan was known;
Clonfert-Mulloo (Co. Laois) begun by Lugaid, that is, Muloo;⁷
Cummián reports and comments on the controversy of new and old

reckonings in which Laisrén avoided the ordeal proposed by that *paries deebatus*, by which he presumably means Fintan (d. A. D. 635/6), successor to Munnu of Teghmon.⁸ Against the ruler of the monks of Munnu, Cummián quoted St. Paul's response after the high priest Ananias had commanded him to be struck across the mouth: "God shall strike you, you whitewashed wall..." (Acts 23.3), for Fintan pretended to observe the traditions of his elders and created discord from the unity which had been achieved at the previous synod of Mag Léna. "The Lord, I hope, will strike him down in whatever way he sees fit!" added Cummián, after Paul.⁹ Against the discord of the old holy man, Cummián argues for Christian unity in celebrating the central feast of the year; and this unity was depicted in ancient terms as well as in terms of contemporary experience.

1. It makes no sense for Britons and Irish to observe an Easter in conflict with the four apostolic sees: Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria;¹⁰
2. It occurs that the whole world (Hebrews, Greeks, Scythians, and Egyptians) observe Easter at the same time, as found by a delegation sent to Rome in 621 whose Irish tables¹¹ gave them a date an entire month later than the others.

Are they all wicked, Cummián asked the holy Ségène and the wise Beccán, or is it we who are on the outer edge of things? Are not the Britons and Irish in these matters but a people on the face of the earth?¹² Ségène, like Fintan, was unmoved by appeals to Christian unity either in apostolic or universal terms. But Cummián was able to present also a series of detailed arguments based upon resources which, though lacking

an appeal to piety and apostolicity, nevertheless served those ends. He had studied the Easter cycles; for a whole year he had withheld judgment, sought out the explanations of different cycles, and analyzed what each race thought about the course of sun and moon. Could he really do this at the outer edge of the whole wide world? Here are the books which he names:

1. Primum illum quem sanctus Patricius papa noster tulit et fecit; in quo luna a XIV. usque in XXI. regulariter, et aequinoctium a XII. kalend. Aprilis observatur.¹³

This was the usage of the ecclesiastical civitas of Milan, apparently following an Alexandrian table of the fourth century. Its limits for observing the Paschal moon were luna XIV-XXI, and luna XIV was the vernal equinox of XII Kal. Aprilis (=21 March) rather than XI Kal. Aprilis (=22 March) - accepting an adjustment to the Julian calendar which stemmed either from Alexandria or perhaps from the Council of Nicaea. The Easter festival would thus occur on the first Sunday after the first full moon after the vernal equinox. This was the system which Augustine must have learned from Ambrose. As the imperial government increasingly used Milan as a residence and seat of administrative government, the church there came to surpass other civitates in influence for northern Italy and Provence from the fourth to the eleventh century. The reckoning survived at some places in Gaul for several centuries, particularly at Auxerre, and it could have been learned by Patrick if he visited Gaul or Provence.

Cummian, however, also quoted from the acts of the Synod of Arles (assembled in A. D. 314 by Constantine to settle the disputed election of Caecilius as bishop of Carthage) concerning the need to celebrate Easter in common with the whole church:

Item Arelatensi synodo sexcentorum episcoporum confirmante primo in loco de observatione Paschae, ut uno die at uno tempore per totum orbem terrarum a nobis conservatur: ut universis¹⁴ Ecclesia uno ore, juxta apostolum, honorificet dominum unum.

The canons of the Synod of Arles survive in at least two versions, and there are also short and long versions of a letter from Bishop Marinus of Arles to newly elected Bishop Silvester of Rome, who had not been present. Confusion of these versions results in an initial canon which states:

Primo loco de observatione Paschae Domini, ut uno die at uno tempore per omnes orbem a nobis observatur [et iuxta consuetudinem litteras ad omnes tu dirigas]...¹⁵

It would appear, therefore, that the Synod of Arles had given some thought to the diversity of Easter dates then practiced and had affirmed the need for unity and consistency. The evident interpolation to the above canon, as it appears in a manuscript of Marinus' letter, affirms that the bishop of Rome would fulfil this need through annual letters, but that expectation was not found in Cummian's source and was indeed misplaced. Doubtless some of them did prepare and circulate such letters in successive years within their area of influence,¹⁶ but that area was most uncertain and their influence was insecure for good reason. At the time of the Synod of Arles, the Roman ecclesiastical civitas was using the older *Supputatio Romana* which had limits of luna XIV-XX, with Easter Sunday following equinox VIII Kal. Aprilis (=25 March). After A. D. 342 this was abandoned in favour of an 84-year cycle with lunar limits XVI-XXII. A further attempt to apply limits for the Sunday of Easter itself, as XI Kal. Aprilis - XI Kal. Maii (=22 March - 21 April), was introduced, and other adjustments suggest that the Romans may never have understood how to compute a date. Dependence upon regular correspondence with the bishop of Alexandria in addition to the tables was frustrating, as Leo (bishop of Rome, A. D. 444-461) pointed out in several letters. Thus the many changes of local usage by Roman bishops would not fulfil the intention of the Synod of Arles at all, and it is not surprising that Milanese usage and Roman variations came into conflict during the fifth century in Roman Africa, as will be discussed below.

Five British clergymen were reported to have been present at the Synod of Arles in A. D. 314: Eborius of York, Rentitius of London, Adelphi de civitate Coloniae Londinensis (perhaps Caesari or Usk).^{16a} Sacerdos Presbyter, and Arminius Diaconus. What system for reckoning Easter this British delegation may have learned at Arles and taken home is, therefore, most uncertain, and all attempts to reconstruct tables on the basis of their attendance there have been contradictory.¹⁷ However, the system attributed to Patrick¹⁷ by Cummian^{17a} was probably never used in Rome but was used in the Milanese civitas and its area of influence.

2. Secundo Anatolium, quem vos extulistis quidem ad verum Paschae rationem dumque pervenire eos qui cyclum LXXXIV. annorum observant.

The Pseudo-Anatolian Canon Paschalis also advocated the vernal equinox at the early Easter limit but took it to be VIII Kal. Aprilis (=25 March) of the earlier Julian calendar, even allowing an exception.

paragraph from Anatolius of Laodicea for this purpose.¹⁸ It held limits for the Paschal moon to be luna XIV-IX, and it strongly rejected the system associated with Patrick. The author may have been a Welsh Briton in the tradition of those British bishops at the Council of Arles in A. D. 314, and his reckoning must have been passed to the Irish long before A. D. 590, for these were the criteria which Columbanus knew at Bangor and which he promoted among the hostile bishops of Gaul.¹⁹ Also apparently accepted at Rome, this Irish canon was an intelligent attack on a 19-year lunar table which was not being used properly, which seems to mean that the table was being applied with the Milanese or "Patrician" criteria of luna XIV-XXI with equinox XII Kal. Aprilis. The canon further rejected an *amplior circulus*, deriving from certain African teachers, which not only advocated those limits but also required Easter Sunday to fall within XI Kal. Aprilis and XI Kal. Maii (-22 March - 21 April). This range was too broad when the equinox was observed on VIII Kal. Aprilis according to Pseudo-Anatolius. Thus the *Acta Synodi Caesareae*, which Cumian cited in the next item as "Theophilus," ought to be rejected, *detestandum ac succidendum esse*.

Both of the usages under attack were adjustments of lunar tables which had been generated to meet local needs elsewhere. The older *Supplicatio Romanae*, with limits of luna XIV-IX and Easter Sunday following equinox VIII Kal. Aprilis, had been used in the Roman civitas only during A. D. 312-347. A later Roman attempt to set limits for Easter Sunday itself of XI Kal. Aprilis - XI Kal. Maii was cited by Hilarianus in A. D. 397 and was probably known to the Irish Pseudo-Anatolius indirectly through its adaptation to a special case in fifth-century Roman Africa. There the *Acta Synodi Caesareae* was produced in an attempt to reconcile divergent criteria, and this too was subject to a reaction in the *Comptes Carthaginiensis* of A. D. 457. Either one could have struck our Irish author as the sophistry of certain Africans.

The Canon Paschalis, however, emphasized solar data, and this could have gained the respect shown it by later scholars, like Bede, even though they advised against following it. Although Pseudo-Anatolius rejected the system of Victorius of Aquitaine, he insisted that movements of the solar year could be accounted for only by use of an 84-year cycle.

3. Terris Theophilus

This is probably a tract headed *Epistola Theophilii*, which was a version of the *Acta Synodi* often quoted in Cumian's letter. It

repeatedly named a Theophilus, bishop of Caesarea, a metropolitan *see* said to have displaced Jerusalem in authority; and it affirmed that he presided over the synod by direction of Victor, *papa Romanus urbis episcopus*. Nevertheless it does not appear to have derived either from Caesarea or from the Theophilus who had disputed Paschal questions with Victor, bishop of Rome (189-98). Nor was it from another Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria (385-412), who had indeed developed a Paschal table but not the one prefaced by this document. The first *Acta Synodi* may have originated in Roman Africa, from where it travelled and was modified in Spain, Celtic Britain, and Ireland. The situations from which each version arose have been accounted for by C. W. Jones:²⁰ Augustine apparently had brought the lunar limits XIV-XXI from Milan to Carthage and Thagaste in A. D. 389/90 and thence to Hippo Regius where he became bishop, A. D. 395-430. These were the limits in use at Alexandria and Magna Graecia, including the bay of Naples and most of southern Italy; they were followed in Milan, northern Italy and parts of southern Gaul, but not in Rome. Churches of the Roman civitas and its sphere of influence were normally dependant upon annual correspondence between the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Alexandria. From time to time the Romans undertook to generate their own tables, though without much luck. The Romans also developed the custom of limiting the Sunday on which Easter would be celebrated to the period XI Kal. Aprilis - XI Kal. Maii (-22 March - 21 April) in order to avoid agnate pagan festivities celebrating the founding of the city. Many cities in the Roman province of Africa accepted Roman guidance and, thus, the two kinds of Easter limits came into conflict there. The first version of the *Acta Synodi* appears to report speeches and discussion from a consultation and answers to a specifically localised problem in fifth century Africa; it may be authentic, and it certainly offers reconciliation. There is evidence that this settlement was rejected by a reassertion of "Roman" criteria in the *Comptes Carthaginiensis* of A. D. 457.

The *Acta Synodi* travelled to Spain under the rubric *Epistola Philippi de Pasche* in some manuscripts, but there it was attributed to a Caesarean synod presided over by Theophilus. Sixth-century modifications include reference to certain churches in Gaul which celebrated Easter every year on the Julian equinox, VIII Kal. Aprilis (-25 March), according to an old Quartaecium custom which was much derided by Cumian as well as by Pseudo-Anatolius. The same phenomenon was also

reported by the Spanish Prologus attributed to Cyril and by the *Tractatus de Ratione Paschae* attributed to Cyprian.

Variants of this Spanish version of the Acts were later complicated in the manuscripts by the introduction of sentences that were intended to emphasise conformity with Dionysian reckoning, which was also becoming known in Irish and Saxon schools during the seventh century. Such a variant was used by Bede in Northumbria by A. D. 725 in his *De Temporibus Ratione Liber* (47: 87-94) in order to refute the *sententia vulgata* that the crucifixion and resurrection had occurred on VIII Kal. and VI Kal. Aprilis (25 and 27 March), the same problem that plagued Spanish and Irish computists. There is no proper edition of any of these variant versions.

4. Quarto Dionysius.

Dionysius Exiguus (ca. A. D. 470-550) was a Scythian scholar living in Rome when he was asked to prepare new Paschal tables, anticipating the expiration of a Latin version of Alexandrian tables with the year 531. He appears to have issued his 95-year continuation with the same incipit and with eight columns of data with headings similar to those of the Alexandrian usage.²¹ However, he also introduced a new column for *anni Domini*, and he made the historical assumption that Jesus had been born on the first year of a 19-year cycle, corresponding to the consulship of C. Caesar and L. Paullus, which we call the year 1 B. C. This invited much criticism during successive centuries.²² By the year A. D. 525, his tables had been given to Petronius of Africa as well as to officials of the Roman curia; the latter group affirmed to Johannes (bishop of Rome, A. D. 523-526) that the date of Easter could be determined and announced on this basis.²³ Despite the fact that Dionysius had shown, for the first time, how to reconcile Alexandrian Paschal limits of luna IV-XII with the Roman custom that restricts Easter Sunday to the period XI Kal. Aprilis - XI Kal. Maii, there is no evidence that his tables were used in the Roman civitas by the time of Cumian, or of Bede, or even by the tenth century.²⁴ Cumian did not cite data from Dionysius' *Tabula Paschalis* or his nine authentic *Argumenta Paschalis*.²⁵ However, the terms used to describe his tenth source will demonstrate that he had at hand the *Frankfurtio* to those tables and both dedicatory letters.

5. Quinto Cyrillum.

The *Epistola de Pascha*, which Cyril (bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 436-444) sent to the Council of Carthage concerning the Easter of A. D. 420, survives in thirteen computational manuscripts, often along with materials related to Irish usage. This authentic letter was also available in the *Canones Ecclesiastici* 38, prepared by Dionysius Exiguus (Pl. 67: 145). However, the Latin version has been put to later use.²⁶ It seems to have been adapted at the behest of Boniface (bishop of Rome, A. D. 607) for the Roman mission in England, which may have been trying to use an 84-year cycle from either Rome or Gaul, or possibly even a Victorian cycle, but which had neglected the extra embolismic month - precisely the question to which Cyril had addressed himself. Boniface repeated Cyril with a slight adaptation to the year 607, repeated some of the queries he had received, then discussed various computational matters in terms which provide indications of theories that are later than those of Cyril or Dionysius. It further appears that the elaborated version of this Cyril-Bonifatius Letter was sent by Laurentius (bishop of Canterbury) to Celtic centres, both British and Irish. It was from the portions added to Cyril's early letter in Rome or in Canterbury that Cumian quoted.²⁷

The *Epistola de Pascha* (or *Epistola Cyrilli*) is found together with Dionysian tables in extant computational collections. It may be that they accompanied it from Rome to Canterbury, or from Canterbury to Celtic centres; but there is an absence of evidence that Dionysian usage had been accepted thus far either in Rome or in Canterbury.²⁸

5. Sexto Morinus.

Disputatio Morini Episcopi Alexandrini de Ratione Paschali.... survives in eight manuscripts. The first part introduced Victorian tables in the sixth century but is scarcely readable. The second part is intelligible and can be dated to either A. D. 604 or 632 by reference to the Victorian *salvus lunae*, but it favours Alexandrian and Dionysian usage against the Pseudo-Anatolian arguments. Thus attribution of the *Disputatio* to a bishop of Alexandria should be ignored, and at least the second part is probably of Irish origin from the early seventh century.²⁹

All extant manuscripts are in Carolingian scripts which misread insular *x*, *v*, *n*, and *p*; thus the forms *Morinus*, *Morinus*, or *Morinus* would correspond to the two reported names of Irish computists from this

period: *Monino* and *Mosinu*. *Monino* *Mocan* was learned in the science of computus, according to Columbanus who had studied at Bangor before A. D. 580, and considered himself competent to challenge bishops of Gaul or Rome concerning Easter reckoning.³⁰ *Mosinu* *marcu* *Min* is said to have been a scribe and abbot of Bangor who "was the first of the Irish who learned by rote the computus from a certain learned Greek"; he is also named as *Sillan*, abbot of Bangor who died A. D. 610.⁴¹ Palaeographically, the names *Monino* and *Mosinu* could be one and the same name. The computus which he memorized could also have been the memory verse which came to be attributed to Pachomius, allowing one to keep track of the lunar aspects in accordance with Alexandrian usage. This would have been an innovation at Bangor after Columbanus' departure.

7. *Septimo Augustinus* (*Agustinus* MS).

Cummian named Augustine in three other places (along with Paul, Jerome, and Gregory) as an advocate against heresy and for unity, and he seems to be rather well-versed in Augustinian thought. Reference to Augustine as a source for computus offers several possibilities, however. The African bishop's best contribution to calendar problems was his long *Epistola ad Januarium*, which might have been known from Eusebius' *Excerpts ex Opere Augustini*. This work abbreviates the *Epistola*, with passages on the phases of the moon added from *De Genesi ad Litteram*.³² Augustine had brought Alexandrian Paschal usage of Milan into Roman Africa, where it conflicted with local Roman custom as explained above. The reconciliation sought in the *Acta Synodi Caesariensis* could have maintained his name in relation to collections of Spanish origin, which were further developed in Ireland as in the *sententiae Sancti Augustini et Isidori in Laude Comptoti*.³³ While the surviving four parts of that accumulation have very little Augustine and much Isidore - the reverse of what one finds in Cummian's letter - its capitulation enumerates fifty-six chapters of a computus no longer found in the fifteen extant manuscripts. Cummian's spelling of the name, *Agustinus*, could certainly be Spanish³⁴ and was retained by Irish scribes in various works.

8. *Octavo Victorinus*.

This Victorinus was a teacher of arithmetic in Aquitaine during the fifth century and wrote a *Calculus* which served to instruct students in arithmetic without arithmology. In A. D. 455, the Alexandrian date of

Easter fell on VII Kal. Maii (~24 April) during Roman pagan celebrations and beyond the limits there preferred. Archdeacon Hilarius requested that Victorinus study this problem, and he answered two years later with a letter accompanied by a *Cursus paschalis* based upon the 19-year lunar cycle of Alexandria which was known in Rome as *Graeco translata*. Victorinus did not concern himself at all with avoiding the problems which had led to Roman discomfiture: on Easter later than 21 April and the need for celebrating the feast together with the other apostolic sees on the same date. Rather he pointed out discrepancies in basic assumptions about rules for calculating the first month (Nisan) and the limits for the Paschal moon, which were lunae XV-XXI for Alexandria but had become by the fifth century lunae XVI-XXII for Rome. In consequence, all tables for 84, 93, or 112 years were not in accordance with the others, were not cyclic for the other period, and should be set aside in favour of reckoning full moons (luna XIV) on the basis of the *annus Passionalis*. This he found from the Eusebius-Jerome *Chronicle* as equivalent to the *annus mundi* 5229 (=A. D. 28). From this point he calculated Easter backwards to creation and forwards to his current A. P. 430 (=A. D. 457). At A. P. 532 (=A. D. 559) it appeared that his data began repeating themselves.³⁵

Victorinus' use of the *annus Passionalis*, however, required him to apply the 19-year cycle out of phase with that of Alexandria, a problem accentuated by the *salutis* lunae. Although he provided alternate dates for Latini when reckonings for Graeci passed Roman limits, he attributed the Graeci Paschal limits to luna XXII, which they never observed. Furthermore, he did not take into account the change of verbal equinox from VIII to XII Kal. Aprilis, which added confusion to the application of his tables.

The Victorian cycle was used only once in Rome (probably by endorsement), but it became popular in Gaul. According to Columbanus, it had been tested and rejected in his part of Ireland before A. D. 580, but it appears to have been favoured still in the mid-seventh century by others. Cummian spoke well of Victorinus, apparently in appreciation of his application of the Alexandrian 19-year cycle and of his rejection of the other kinds of Easter tables.³⁶

9. *Nono Paschalis monachum, Aegypti coenobitarum fundatorem; et ab angelo ratio Paschae dictata est.*

Pachomius was a cenobite of Upper Egypt who lived ca. A. D. 320-367. His activities began about 320 at Tabennisi in the Thebaid, where he

linked cells of hermits into great colonies. The reference by Cumian is to sixteen verses, which may have been composed by a Visigoth in Spain (ca. A. D. 600) whence they soon came to be known in Ireland and Gaul: *Womae Aprilis norunt quines...*³⁷ They provide in memorable form the Julian date for the Paschal moon and the ferial regular for each year of the Alexandrian 19-year cycle in Latin usage. The ferial regular for each year is a number which indicates the difference between the weekday on XII Kal. Aprilis (=24 March) and the weekday on which the Paschal full moon occurs. To this one adds the concurrents and thus learns the weekday of the Easter limit, beyond which Easter does not occur in that year. The verses seem to have been known at Bangor about A. D. 605, and the *Epistola Cyrilli*, cited above, received an addition which could have had an insular source prior to the Easter problem of 607, and which reported angelic voices to Pachomius, pertaining ut non *errores incurrent in sollemnitate paschalis ratione...*, on the basis of Commodian's fifth-century account.³⁸ With these verses, the dates and aspects for nineteen years of an Alexandrian cycle could be remembered anywhere, anytime.

10. *Declino trecimorum decem et octo episcoporum decemnovemallem cyclum (qui Graeco Enneacodeceteride dicitur) in quo kalendae Januarii lunaeque ejusdem diei et initia primi mensis Ignorantiae relicta tenebris, studiosis quibusque cunctis temporibus sunt adlocata, quibus paschalis sollemnitas probabiliter inveniri potest.*

No Paschal table survives from the Council of Nicaea, though epistolary references to it suggest that there had been agreement on certain rules which are simple and memorable: Easter will be celebrated on the first Sunday after the first full moon after the vernal equinox, and that equinox was assumed to occur on XII Kal. Aprilis (=21 March). This became a tradition which attached itself to certain Easter tables, among them the Dionysian ones. In the preface to his tables, Dionysius had been satisfied to cite the *sancti patres* as the source for the Alexandrian tables, upon which his own were based; but in both his *Epistola ad Petronium* and his *Epistola ad Bonifatium* at Bonum he identified them with the 318 *memorabiles pontifices et sancti* at Nicaea accepting a tradition which had been developing for a century and a half.³⁹ Cumian cited *Sicoma sinodus CCCXIII episcoporum*, and he also quoted one phrase, *decemnovemallem qui Graeco enneacodeceteride (dicitur)*, which could have been found either in the preface to Dionysius' *Tabula Paschalis* or in his *Epistola ad Petronium*. The second phrase, *Ignorantiae*

relicta tenebris, studiosis, is from the *Epistola ad Bonifatium* at Bonum.⁴⁰ However, neither these writings nor the tables deriving from Dionysius offer data for the first and fourteenth moons of the first month (Nisan) or for the *kalendae Januarii lunaeque ejusdem diei*. Dionysius reckoned the age of the moon or the number of aspects on the Kalends of September, *sedes epactarum*, in keeping with Alexandrian usage; and he ignored the Kalends of January. Other tables generated under Roman influence, such as the *Liberulus* of Augustalis which ran for a hundred years (213-312) on the basis of an 84-year cycle, reckoned the age of the moon on the Kalends of January. Thus, it was probably not a Dionysian table to which Cumian referred.

The ten computational items named by Cumian have very intricate histories of their own and are now found in a variety of versions that are really quite amazing. Each requires a critical edition which would show the efforts of many highly trained men to conceive of relations between sun and moon and earthly history such that the Christian festival could be celebrated everywhere and by everyone on the same date, year after year. But each attempt failed. Each attempt, nevertheless, survived and was adapted to new circumstances in new places. The calculations that these computations require are multiple but not very sophisticated in themselves, whereas their applications and their relationships are complex. Cumian assessed these complexities and was faced with many difficulties. The 84-year cycle of "our cycle," he found, was out of phase with the rest of the world. Moreover, the cycle set forth different weekdays on the Kalends of January (both for common and bissextile years), a different first month (Nisan) and thus a different Paschal moon (luna XIV), and finally a different equinox (that is, Julian 23 March rather than Nicaean 21 March). Even the work of Anatolius, upon whom the Irish *ordo paschae* depended, could be cited as admitting that no true cycle could be achieved through his rules of computation. On the other hand, Alexandrian Easter could be known either from the table of Victorinus or from the Pachomian verses promoted by Mesius, abbot of Bangor. There survive tables of Irish origin which show that different systems of Victorinus and Dionysius were being compared by scholars on various occasions.⁴¹ But finally a very clear table so that, leaving behind the darkness of ignorance and taking note of all the assembled data, anyone can come to a certain knowledge of the date of Easter.⁴² Could one give a rational account of these?

What was needed was education in cycles of sun and moon and in basic arithmetic. This is what Cumian argued would lead to the truth, and it is what he called upon Sigeen to provide when his letter ended with the assertion not to err, but especially not to *err* knowingly.⁴³ It was knowledge to be found by study both of the scriptures and of the cycles. Bede's great respect for Irish scholarship depends upon this science which flourished within a context of piety.

Old science is dull reading and mercifully tends to disappear.

There survives, however, some fragmentary evidence in many manuscripts that drills in arithmetic were done, even though mistakes are occasionally found. Especially numerous are sections of computational cycles and computational arguments, which either explain how to apply the principles or how to get the answer directly without any principles. Broader studies of natural phenomena made their appearance in this way, attracted to pages of computational texts and other schoolbooks.

One of the most important schoolbooks of our period was written in Seville in A. D. 612 by Isidore. I am not referring to his encyclopedic *Origines*, first drafted in 612 = 620 and developed in several versions to supply all sorts of information to those who read or preached the scripture. Rather, I mean his schoolbook, *De Natura Rerum*, which was intended to guide the basic scientific education of anyone and seems to have done so for almost everyone for several centuries.⁴⁴ The extent to which it was known in insular schools is not at all clear, however. Within the Celtic range from Britain to southern Irish, we find the use of one or another word or phrase which could have derived from the *De Natura Rerum*; but Fontaine could only assume that it had reached Ireland on the basis of verbal stages in the added chapter 44. However, it was transcribed in Clm 396 by an early ninth-century scribe who certainly was trained in the Hispanic practices, as revealed in his colophon. And the commentary on *Conatus Maior* in MS St. Paul-in-Karnten Stiftsbibliothek 25.2.16 (s. VIII in.) ff. 21-42 contains an epitome *Ad Cumianum* with further passages reported to have Isidore's school-book as a source, copied by an Anglo-Saxon hand.⁴⁵

What then of Saxon schools? In the monastery of Malmesbury Aldhelm was educated by the Irish Meladubh, according to William of Malmesbury. Although Aldhelm's somewhat obscure poems often invited comment, his was not a purely literary education. He wrote of three disciplines *philosophorum: Physicos, Ethicos, et Topicos*, of which the seven *Physicos* areas were listed by him in three separate works and cited in a fourth:

*Arithmetica, Geometrica, Musica, Astronomia, Astrologia, Mechanica, Medicina.*⁴⁶ He learned a little arithmetic but admitted that *difficillima rerum argumenta et calculi supputationes, quas partes numeri appellant, lectionis instantia repperi.*^{46a} This probably referred to those number groups which one has to keep in mind when multiplying or dividing. Roman calculi were the pebbles or roundels moved across a board for calculations, in other words, a form of abacus. The reckoning learned at Malmesbury may not have satisfied his later master at St. Augustine's Canterbury in the monastic school of Hadrian (ca. 670-672), and like most students, Aldhelm regarded "all my past labour of study as of little value," since he could keep those *partes numeri* in mind only with a struggle and when "sustained by heavenly grace."⁴⁷ But the fuller range of arithmetic was included with the *computus*, a subject with which Aldhelm was very much concerned. He seems to have known the letter sent by Bishop Vitalinus of Rome (657-672)⁴⁸ to King Oswin of Northumbria before the Council of Whitby, as is indicated in his letter to Geraint, king of Devon and Cornwall and to the bishops of Devon and Cornwall. He wished to convince them that the 84-year cycle with lunae XIV-XX should be abandoned in favour of the rules of the 118 fathers. Those fathers at the Council of Nicaea ascribed a 19-year cycle in a perpetual intercalary which ran *per cyrclos et eodindum* with Paschal limits lunae XV-XXI, according to Aldhelm. On the other hand the 19-year computation of Anatolius and the 84-year rule of Sulpicius Severus "observe the paschal solemnity on lunae XIV along with the Jews" which is an Oriental heresy; they should be set aside "since neither follow the bishops of the Roman Church in their perfect method of computation." Before continuing his explanation of the heretical "quartodecimans," Aldhelm added that the Roman bishops "also declared that the paschal *computus* of Victorius, which observes a cycle of 532 years, should not be followed in future."⁴⁹ This appeal to Geraint and his bishops is set within a general appeal to unity with the church fathers and to their charity, in contrast to the bishops of Dyfed. His appeal to the use of Peter is made with respect only to the question of Easter and, in that regard, echoes Wilfrid's claim as repeated by Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3, 25. As Michael Vernum has pointed out,⁵⁰ the letter carries out the appeal of Theodore to the Synod of Hertford (September, 672) and its first canon "that we all keep Easter Day at the same time, namely on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the moon of the first month" (Bede, *HE* 4.2), and as

could have been written at the behest of any widely attended council with the same concerns thereafter, during Aldhelm's abbacy of Malmesbury (673/47 - 705/6). The Britons in Wales, subject to the kingdom of Wessex, accepted the new *ordo Paschae* in the year that Aldhelm became bishop of Sherborne (705/6).

The English settlement of Easter problems at Whitby in 664 favoured an Alexandrian reckoning in Dionysian terms, which was justified partly in the language of Petrine mythology that must have appealed to Irish *Romani* as well as to bishops of Canterbury. But it was accepted in London only in A. D. 729. British participation in these matters has left almost no record until the tenth century.⁵¹ Some of those subject to Wessex accepted it in 864, but others, only in 909, under the authority of the Roman see of Crediton.

The terms for the seven *fisicos artes* used by Aldhelm could have been found in Isidore's *Differentiarum Libri Duo*, sections 149-152. Aldhelm's references to *geometria*, *astronomia*, and *astrologia* were suggested from Isidore's *Origines* 3.10.3 (geometry concerns measure of lengths and the terms of measurement) and *De Natura Rerum* 18 and 24-26. *Astrologia* pertains to rising, falling, visibility, and circular courses of stars through the heavens as they circle the earth, while *astronomia* or the non-Isidorian term *lex astrorum* accounts for the movements of planets and their periods of orbit. Although the terms themselves had been used by Roman mathematicians (that is, astrologers and magicians), in the hands of both Isidore and Aldhelm there is a complete absence of number mysticism and celestial influences.⁵² On the other hand, Aldhelm seems to have used the knowledge gained at Canterbury of "arithmetic and all the mysteries of the stars in the heavens." In this letter from Canterbury to a West Saxon bishop, he emphasised "intense disputation of computation"; the profound subject of the "zodiac, the circle of twelve signs that rotates at the peak of heaven"; and "the complex reckoning of the horoscope" which "requires laborious investigation of the expert."⁵³ Horoscopes in this context means an instrument for reckoning astronomical phenomena, such as the sundial moonfinder, or horologium *astrorum* - a timetable of stellar night movements.⁵⁴ Furthermore, there is extant in several manuscripts a *Cyclos Aldhelmi de Cursu Lunae per Signa XII Scandula Graeca*, based upon a synodical moon of 29 1/2 days. From this cyclos was generated the lunar A-V series, which survives in four manuscripts without the table. This is one of several efforts to determine the relation of the moon to

the zodiac: that band of heavenly space through which sun and moon pass and which was arbitrarily described in twelve equal sections by names of constellations (some of which are extremely difficult actually to see). The *Cyclos Aldhelmi* was not successful and dropped out of use very early because it was based upon the synodical rather than the sideral moon (27 1/3 days). Bede made this correction, while computists at Fleury and Auxerre attempted further adaptations, though none of these tables made a lasting contribution to knowledge. This series of efforts at observation and calculation of the moon's course could not attain sufficient precision for lack of an adequate instrument, a need which began to be met only in the last quarter of the tenth century with the first Latin astrolabe.⁵⁴

The works of Bede could supply much more evidence, of course, for *arithmetica* and *astronomia*, and his works are being assessed very fruitfully in terms of scientific assumptions and accomplishments which have been heretofore cited more often than understood.⁵⁵ Beyond Jarrow and Wearmouth, however, there was a study of these essential scientific subjects in many schools, which has been little suspected and which may normally be traced by attention to evidence of computation. To what has, thus far, been presented may be added yet another scientific concern which may be illustrated by a description of a fourth and especially English version of Isidore's *De Natura Rerum*. It is concerned with the shape of the whole earth, its continents, and its discovery with reference to the shape of the heavens.

Cumman led us through the groundwork of Paschal questions in Ireland, and he will also lead us to Isidore among the West Saxons as well as to the earth as a globe.⁵⁶ There is only one surviving manuscript of Cumman's letter, MS London BL Cotton Vitellius A.XIII, f. 79-83. In the binding it was given after the Robert Cotton fire of 1731 seven different books were put together, and the first of them is itself a small collection which was transcribed in great haste towards the end of the eleventh century, f. 4-72 (new foliation). It contains Hrabanus' *De Computo*, a set of computational memory verses, Isidore's *De Natura Rerum*, with the whole enclosed by a short work by Abbo of Fleury. At the very beginning is the Penitential of Egbert, and at the end is a Martyrology from the West Country. This is another instance of science within a context of piety; where it was all written, I do not know. However, its central contents duplicate those of MS Rinter 3507, written a century earlier in large and beautiful Anglo-Saxon

corvise, from about A. D. 960 to 986. There are a half dozen English manuscripts with excerpts of Hrabanus' *computus*, and there are also six English manuscripts from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries containing Isidore's *De Natura Rerum*. There is, however, no overlap between the two groups,⁵⁷ save the Exeter and Vitellius copies.

It can be shown that both Aldehelm and Bede used the short version of Isidore.⁵⁸ From the text and studies presented by Jacques Fontaine,⁵⁹ we know that the short forty-six-chapter version was sent by the author to young King Siæbut of the Visigoths in A. D. 612, and that the king responded in a verse letter that shows how useful the work would be by providing a systematic explanation of a solar eclipse, illustrated by an excellent diagram. But Isidore added another chapter in A. D. 613 concerning the sphere of the earth in three continents, and added drawings of the *rota terrarum*. Someone else added a chapter on the seas and winds and elaborated parts of other chapters for the long version.

It was the last described long version which I expected to find in Exeter and Vitellius, but this text has been elaborated even more in dozens of places. Moreover, this fourth version has been glossed with lines taken from the Epistola of Siæbut but attributed to Isidore; this implies that Aldehelm's short version of *De Natura Rerum* with the anonymous letter had been used to gloss the English fourth version. Finally, the name of Isidore had been set aside in favour of attribution to Oïdas, a change which occurred also in Hrabanus' *computus*. In fact, these works were receiving a great deal of attention and development during the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries - doubtless in schools where Irish, Roman, and Briton interacted with each other as student, master, monk: schools such as Oswald's Clowchester, Aldehelm's Malmesbury, or Glastonbury, where interest in Oïdas flourished. In these establishments argument could and did occur about the correct *computus*, cycles of sun and moon, and positions of planets through the zodiacal band.

Since A. D. 612, Isidore's *De Natura Rerum* concluded with chapter 48, *de partibus terre*, and a *rota terrarum*, one of seven illustrated chapters. The *rota terrarum* is a well-known diagram and, generally, not taken seriously by cartographers. But its use by Isidore in the early seventh century led us to the earliest examples which are still extant. The diagram was oriented not to the north (as modern cartographers prefer) but to the east, normally. It was the basis for the earliest real maps in the late eighth century, maps which display known (but very distant) islands in the seas, according to a distorting

curvature.⁶⁰ For *partes septentrionales*, this gave a visual context for Cusiman's image of *montagne orbis terrarum*.⁶¹

In the two earliest manuscripts of the fourth version, the English version of *De Natura Rerum*, Domitian I (s.X²), has the standard tripartite *rota*, but the Exeter 3507 (s.X^{ex}) has a more elaborate figure which includes three lists of place names. These names are grouped under continent headings *Asia*, *Africa*, *Europa* - but with an unexpected reversal: *Africa* is on the lower left, *Europa* on the lower right. Historians of cartography have been satisfied to say that this reversal was merely an ancient error when it occurred in manuscripts of Strabo or Lucan, and especially of Isidore.⁶² Among historians of science it is a commonplace that medieval scribes are notorious for silly errors, and that nothing was too gauche for Isidore. My own collations of *computus* texts have turned up errors, but sometimes they may reveal a busy mind. How could intelligent scholars accept and use a reversed *rota*?

A possible explanation may be sought in astronomy, both past and present. There have always been two perspectives on the globe of the heavens and its stellar phenomena which would result in two quite different projections of star charts and land charts.⁶³ If the scholar looks up at the sky with *Asia* and its *Oceanus orientalis* at his head, then *Europa est dextera*, *Africa est laeva*. On the other hand, if he imagines himself outside the globe and looking east, he would see *Europa est laeva*, *Africa est dextera*. Both perspectives are found in the popular literature of Aratus and Hyginus, as well as in sophisticated planispheres of Fulda and of Ealsburg, which I have elsewhere called *Hipparchan* and *Ptolemaic*.⁶⁴ Geographers prepared pictures of their terrestrial spheres, normally with *Asia* and its *Oceanus orientalis* at the head of a chart, and the other parts were projected on the flat surface according to either perspective. From the outer perspective *Europa est laeva*, as with MS Domitian; from the inner perspective *Europa est dextera*, as with MS Exeter, requiring that one keep in mind a distinction between regions of the heavens and regions of the earth.

Thus, we may recognise two conventions for representing the hemisphere, each of which had intelligible consequences. Neither the Isidorian image nor the reversed image of the globe indicates a lack of understanding, a failure of observation, or a repetition of error. Both may be best understood in terms of a priority of the spherical cosmos and spherical earth.

In conclusion, therefore, we have abundant evidence of piety but only scraps of science. The holy Fintan is remembered by a Vita which mentions Laisrén only because he was awe-struck by sanctity. But the warning of Cumian to Ségné of Iona was forceful. His argument for a new *ordo Paschae* was heeded slowly but surely by others, mostly anonymous, who learned their *calculi supputatio* on reckoning boards with Althelm, observed the equinox with Bede, and counted epacta and tasted various computi until they found that the Dionysian system really did work. This was computistics which encompassed the cycles of sun and moon and planets for their own sake and certainly went well beyond the needs of Easter dates, in the service of Christian unity and apostolicity.

NOTES

¹The scholarly conflict about the Alexandrian, Milanese, Roman, Victorian, and Celtic systems for determining the date for Easter - all of which flourished in the seventh century - have generated much literature in the twentieth century as well. The best historical introduction is by C. W. Jones, *Beda's Opera de Temporibus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943), pp. 3-122, to be supplemented below.

²The Synod of Whitby was presented as a closed case by Bede *HE* 3.25. The monks of Iona celebrated Easter correctly (according to Bede) on the 24 April, A. D. 729, as a result of Egbert's preaching and holy life among them; Egbert who had studied in Ireland thus completed the work of the Scots Aidan, who had brought holiness from Iona to Northumbria (*HE* 5.22), and Adomnán who spread the Northumbrian teaching among most northern Irish except his own Iona.

Abbo studied in the monastery of St. Benoît-sur-Loire at Fleury, long an important centre of computational studies. His letters to Gerald and Asper in A. D. 1003-1004 challenged Bede's acceptance of Dionysius Exiguus' tables for A. D. 532-611 and their historical assumptions, and justified a 22-year shift in the year of the Incarnation. One of his two letters on this topic was published by Pierre Varin (1849) and reprinted by A. Cordoliani, "Abbon de Fleury, *Épître* de Lobbes et Gerland de Besançon, sur l'ère de l'Incarnation de Notre Seigneur le Petit," *Revue de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 44 (1949): 463-87; there are three Geraldos to be distinguished. A second letter survives in five manuscripts but has not been edited.

³Grammar, song, and reckoning are broad fields which included those studies which were essential for monastic schools in their vocational purposes, just as the seven arts of Hellenistic instruction had been considered useful for the very different purposes of the Roman elite. Carolingian romansiers attempted to reinforce the learning of their schools by citing the categories of Roman pedagogy from Boethius, Cassiodorus, or Isidore; but the working patterns of their schools are better expressed through the practices of grammar, centes, computistica. See W. Stevens, introduction to *Rabani de Computo* CCM 44 (Turnhout, 1979): 165-68. This emphasis has been explored in many essays by C. W. Jones.

⁴Tres opciones dantur tibi, Laurens: id est, duo libri in ignem mittentur, liber veteris ordinis et sicut, ut videmus, quis coram de igne liberabitur; vel duo sumantur, unus annus, alter tempus, in unum ignem recludantur; et domus comburatur, et videbimus, quis ex eis evadit domus recludantur; et domus ad sepulchrum mortui luctus sumantur, et intactus igne. Aut domus ad sepulchrum mortui luctus sumantur, et reuscitentur cum, et indicet nobis, que ordine debemus hoc anno Pasche celebrare." *Vita Sancti Marci* 27, ed. G. Plummer (Oxford, 1920; repr. 1968), 2: 237.

17. For British bishops at Arles see B. Krusch, "Die Einführung des griechischen Paschalritus im Abendlande," *Neues Archiv* 9 (1884), 167.

17a. For the use of Patrick as an authority in the Easter controversy, see Jones, ed., *Bede's Opera*, pp. 86-87; 89; 91, n. 3; 93; 95, n. 1; 101; 109.

18. Pseudo-Anatolius' *Canon Paschalis* of Liber de Ratione Paschalis, ed. B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, der 4. Jährige Osterzyklus und seine Quellen (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 316-27. Nine manuscripts of the text, whole or fragmentary, have now been identified. Authentic passages from Anatolius were given by Eusebius, *Ecclasiastical History* 7.32, and the Latin translation of A. D. 395 by Rufinus 8.28, cited by Bede, *De Temporibus Ratione* 4 (ed. Jones, p. 211), 31 (p. 237), 42 (p. 256).

19. Jones, ed., *Bede's Opera*, pp. 78-87.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-89 et passim. A new attempt to sort out the several versions will be outlined in W. M. Stevens, *Catalogue of Computational Tracts*, soon to be completed. Notice that there was a Caesarea in Neuretanis to which Augustine travelled in A. D. 418 to deal with some dispute; see Gerald Bonner, "Augustine's visit to Caesarea in 418," in *Studies in Church History* 1, ed. C. W. Dugmore and G. Duggan (London, 1964) pp. 104-113.

21. The works of Dionysius are cited from the edition by J. W. Jan, *Malla*, 1749, esp. PL 67: 19-22, 453-520. For the *Tabula Paschalis* and *Praefatio* Jan used MS Berlin Staatsbibl. Phillippe 1830 (cat. 129) 63 (x. [x2] f. 63-67) for the letters he used MS Oxford H. Digby (s. VII¹¹) f. 64-86v. Th. Hansen collated the Digby manuscript once more with Jan's edition, and this was published by B. Krusch, *Die Entstehung unserer heutigen Zeitrechnung*, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie, Jahrgang 1937, Philol.-hist. Klasse, Wr. 8 (Berlin, 1938). However, I have now identified fourteen additional manuscripts of the *Epistola ad Petronium* and twenty-three of the *Epistola ad Bonifatium*, many of these earlier than MS Digby 63. Critical editions are needed.

22. The problem was formal, in that it avoided the Roman habit of reckoning the beginning point twice, that is once from each direction, thinking, [K. Harrison, *The Framework of Anglo-Saxon History* to A. D. 900 (Cambridge, 1976) p. 37.] Bede's *De Temporibus Ratione* 47 was able to rebut the criticism of this solution only with difficulty, and *annus incarnationis*, e.g., *Florus* of Lyons, Abbo of Fleury, Marianne Scotus, Robert of Marston, et al.

23. *Exemplum suppositiois Bonifatii*, ed. B. Krusch, "Ein Bericht der päpstlichen Kammer," in *Papsttum und Kaiserthum*, *Festschrift* P. Mehr, ed. A. Brackman (Munich, 1926), pp. 56-58.

24. F. Rühl (*Chronologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* [Berlin, 1897], p. 171) thought that he had found Dionysian indications in Roman documents by A. D. 584, thus implying that his *Tabula Paschalis* was being used. Indications, however, were an Alexandrian usage which had been present in Paschal tables previous to Dionysius and could be continued without his changes.

25. Only the first nine of the *Argumenta Paschalis* are authentic, of those attributed to Dionysius in the editions of Jan and Krusch. Many of those which are authentic do not have the proper terms and reckonings for Dionysius' *annus praesens*. Many new manuscripts have been identified since 1937, but all texts have been adapted to later applications. A critical edition is needed.

26. This explanation follows the proposals of C. W. Jones, *Bede's Opera*, pp. 93-97; cf. A. Cordoliani, "Computistes insulaires et las écrits pseudo-Alexandrins," *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* (Paris, 1945/1946), vol. 106 [= 107 (publ. 1948)]: 24-28. The best edition is that of B. Krusch, *Studien* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 344-49; but thirteen manuscripts have now been identified which would allow for an improved edition and a better account of this rather murky situation. There were two Bonifaces (February to November 607, and 607/8 to 613) and the most prominent question in this letter is the Easter date VIII Kal. Maii (=23 April), as emphasized by K. Harrison, "Luni-Solar Cycles: their Accuracy and Some Types of Usage," in *Saints, Scholars & Scribes*, *Festschrift in Honour of C. W. Jones*, ed. M. H. King and W. M. Stevens, 2 vols. (Collegeville, Minn., 1979), 2: 73-74.

27. "Scrutininique, ut Cyrillus ait, 'quod ordinavit synodus Nicomae quatuordecim annorum per decemordinalem cyclum...'" *Lunes quatuordecim annorum per decemordinalem cyclum*, ed. Krusch, *Studien*, Works, 4: 440. Cf. *Epistola Cyrilli de Pascha*, ed. Krusch, *Studien* p. 347.

28. Two others items which also bear the name of Cyril were composed either in Africa, *Praefatio Cyrilli* (A. D. 482?), or in Spain, *Prologus* to *Cyrilli* (A. D. 577-590?), to oppose Victorius of Aquitaine and to *Cyrilli* (A. D. 577-590?), to oppose Victorius of Aquitaine and to *Cyrilli* (A. D. 577-590?). The *Praefatio Cyrilli* cites Theophilus promote Alexandrian reckoning. The *Praefatio Cyrilli* was written, then, of Alexandria and both were originally accompanied by tables; but there is no indication that either was known to Cumian. See Krusch, *Studien*, pp. 89-98; Jones, *Bede's Opera*, pp. 38-54. A. Cordoliani, "Textes de Computo Paschalis del siglo IV: El Prologo Cyrilli," *Hispania Sacra* 9 (1956): 127-39.

29. The best available edition is not very good: L. Muratori, *Anecdota Latina* (Milano-Padua, 1713), 3: 193-98, rep. PL 139: 1357-1358. This from MS Milano Bib. Ambrosiana H.150 inf. (s. IX in) f. 80-81v. This was reprinted in parallel with a second version from MS Tours 2. num. 334 (s. IX) f. 16v-18 by A. Cordoliani, "Computistes insulaires..." p. 30-34. See also C. W. Jones, "The 'Lost' Sirmund Manuscript of Bede's 'Computus,'" *SRN* 52 (1937): 218, and *Bede's Opera* (1943), p. 97.

30. Columbanus, *Epistola ad Gregorium*, ed. C. S. M. Walker, *S. Columbanus Opera* (Dublin, 1957) pp. 2-13.

Astronomia in the Fulda School, in *Saints, Scholars and Heroes* (cited above), 2: 27-28 and notes 2-5.

⁵² Epistola no. 1 (perhaps addressed to Leutharius of Winchester, A. D. 670-676), Ewald, ed. pp. 475-78; Berren, trans. pp. 152-53.

⁵³ For Bede's observations to determine the equinox by means of horizonlogia inspections, see E. Harrison, "Easter Cycles and the Equinox in the British Isles," *ASS* 7 (1978): 1-8.

⁵⁴ C. W. Jones, *Bede's Pseudopigrapha* (Ithaca, 1939), pp. 68-70; Bede's *DW* 19, ed. Jones, *Bede's Opera*, pp. 219 and 354; cf. also the Welsh fragment cited in n. 51 above. For the Latin astrolabe, see Marcel Destombes, "On astrolabe carolingien et l'origine de nos chiffres arabes," *Archives Internationales d'Histoire des Sciences*, no. 58-59 (1962), pp. 1-45. Rejection of a date before x.xii by Guy Beaujouan, "Enseignement du quadrivium," *Settimane di Studio* 19 (Spoleto, 1972): 658-62, was based upon a lack of literary citation and upon divergent speculations by Destombes and Beaujouan about the early forms of numerals. The Latin words on all parts of the instrument however appear to me to be in the style of tenth-century Visigothic script. I wish to express great appreciation to Professor Destombes for inviting me to handle this astrolabe in his apartment, 24 April, 1975.

⁵⁵ See especially the essays by E. Harrison cited above; and also Y. R. Echarade, "Venerable Bede as a Scientist," *American Benedictine Review* 21 (1971), 486-507, and other essays, together with a dissertation which should be published: "Original Aspects in Venerable Bede's Tidal Theories" (Saint Louis University, 1970).

⁵⁶ Germaine Aujac, "L'image du globe terrestre dans la Grèce antique," *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences* 27 (1974): 193-210; W. M. Stevens, "The Figure of the Earth in Isidore's 'De Natura Rerum,'" *Jais* 71 (1980): 268-77.

⁵⁷ The six English manuscripts are *Easter Cathedral* 3507 (A-S) minuscule post A. D. 960) f. 67-67v; London BL Cotton Domitian I (English Caroline minuscule s.x²) f. 1-37; Vitellius A.xii (Norman minuscule s.xi ex) f. 46-64; Oxford, BL *Auct.* F.3.14 (s.xii) f. 1-19v; *Auct.* F.2.20 (s.xii) f. 1-16v; St. John's College CLXVIII (s. XIV) f. 9-37v. A study of these is in preparation.

⁵⁸ Two verses of the *Epistula simoniaci* were quoted in letters of Aldhelm without identification. One of them is repeated in the *Easter* and Vitellius MSS as a gloss and attributed to Isidore. Bede's works draw upon Isidore's *De Natura Rerum* but not from any of the chapters which form the *medias* or *long* version. Note especially Bede's *DW* 51, "divisio terrarum," which has contents parallel with Isidore's chapter 48 but proceeds to describe the diagram in the opposite direction and does not quote or paraphrase him. Thus it is likely that Aldhelm and Bede used the short and not the long version.

⁵⁹ Fontaine ed., pp. 38-45 (n. 34 above).

⁶⁰ MS Albi Bibl. Echagade 29 (n. VIII²) f. 37v of *Laugandae provenance*, ed. Fr. Clorius, *Itineraria et Alia Geographica* CSEL 173 (Turnhout, 1965): 467-68, f. 64, f. 64m. MS Vat. Lat. 6018 (n. VIII/XI) f. 63v-64 ed. Clorius, *ibid.*; and *Anonymus Cartographus Vetus* 1018

Aevi, A. D. 1200-1500, ed. R. Almagia and M. Destombes, vol. I: *Nappemondes* (Amsterdam, 1964), pl. XIX.

⁶¹ In addition, we note that the statement from the Synod of Arles that Easter should be observed on the same day and at the same time *per omnes orbem* has been given by Cumian as *per totum orbem terrarum* (quoted above).

⁶² Destombes, *Nappemondes* (1964), p. 37 (Sallust); G. R. Crone, "The Hereford World Map" (London, 1949), p. 6: "The draughtsman has carelessly interchanged the names of Africa and Europa."

⁶³ P. McGurk, "Germanici Caesaris Aratea cum Scholiis, a New Illustrated Witness from Wales," *National Library of Wales Journal* 18 (1973): 197-216, esp. 200-1. Of course anyone may observe modern astronomers using the reversal of East and West in current star-charts on the assumption that one looks up at the stars.

⁶⁴ See note 56, above.

The term *geminus stylus*, which serves as partial title for this paper, has been taken from the Preface to Hrabanus Maurus' prose version of the *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*. Justifying his intention to write in prose on the same subject on which he had just written in verse,

Hrabanus says:

Nos apud veteres fuit ut gemino stylo propria conderent opera, quo jucundiora simul et utiliora ess legentibus forent ingenia. Unde et apud saeculares et apud ecclesiasticos plurimi ioveniuntur qui metro at prosa unam eandemque rem descriperunt. Ut de caeteris tacemus, quid aliud Prosper ac venerandus vir Bedulius facisse carnetur?...Hoc igitur exemplo...ego quidem vilissime homuncio, opus quod in laudem sanctae crucis metrico stylo condidi, in prosam vertere curavi.¹

Geminus stylus according to this definition is writing on one subject in both prose and verse. The definition clearly differentiates it from the so-called *prosimetrum* or *chamafable*, which alternates prose and verse within one work; Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*² or the anonymous *Auceassin et Nicoloette*³ are composed in this manner. Moreover, Hrabanus stresses that "una et eadem res" be treated in verse and in prose, but he does not stipulate the order in which they are to be written, nor does he demand that the same writer compose both versions. Any writer, therefore, who either writes on one subject in prose and verse, or who transposes an earlier prose work into verse or an earlier poetic work into prose, can justly be called a *geminus stylus* writer.

Even though the term *geminus stylus* was coined in the Frankish Empire, writing in this manner was widespread and flourished in England in the two centuries before Hrabanus.⁴ Four Anglo-Latin⁵ works fall into this category: Aldhelm's *De Virginitate*,⁶ Bede's *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*,⁷ his *Vita S. Paulini*,⁸ and Alcuin's *Vita S. Willibrordi*.⁹ Of these only the *Vita S. Paulini* is a prose translation of the work by another author, namely, Neodinus of Wells.¹⁰

This paper examines the reasons why Anglo-Latin writers wrote in the *geminus stylus*; it proceeds by looking at the opinions which

scholars currently have on this topic, by examining the reasons which the poets give, by comparing the content and structure of the verse with that of the prose, by evaluating the influences of earlier *geminus stilus* writers on the Anglo-Latin authors, and finally by assessing the manuscript evidence.

Modern scholars who have written on *geminus stilus* works are Colgrave,¹¹ Curtius,¹² Klopsch,¹³ and Strunk.¹⁴ Curtius is the authority whom the others follow. He says: "Antiquity did not conceive of poetry and prose as two forms of expression differing in essence and origin"¹⁵ and "the practice [of writing in the *geminus stilus*] shows us that metrical and non-metrical discourse were felt to be interchangeable arts."¹⁶ Klopsch argues: "From the ancient theory of literature the Middle Ages have taken over two views about the relation of prose to verse: one that poetry is older and more valuable than prose; two, that metrical and non-metrical discourse are interchangeable."¹⁷ Strunk talks about the "interchangeability of prose and verse,"¹⁸ and so does Colgrave, even though he is, as far as I can see, the only scholar who defines the term "interchangeable" more closely; to him it means "that the same subject could be treated in prose or verse without materially altering the sense."¹⁹ Like Curtius, Colgrave points to the *geminus stilus* writers as proof of his theory, and examines especially the Bedan double version of the *Vita S. Guthberti*.²⁰ In effect, both Curtius and Colgrave reduce the *geminus stilus* versions to a "literary" or "rhetorical exercise."²¹ Curtius claims, for instance, "that a large part of early Christian poetry is a continuation of the antique rhetorical practice of paraphrase."²²

This explanation is not quite satisfactory. We are told that the *geminus stilus* writers compose two versions of their works because they wish to paraphrase whichever one they wrote first, and in doing this they show that prose and verse are interchangeable. The "rhetorical practice of paraphrase" may well have been the midwife at the birth of the *geminus stilus*; I question, however, whether the twins thus born (to remain with the image) were really identical, that is, fully interchangeable.

In view of Colgrave's and Curtius' statements, the most striking feature is the total absence of any remarks by either Aldhelm, Bede or Alcuin which would indicate that they are writing their *geminus stilus* works in order to show the interchangeability of prose and verse. Instead, all three give the difference between the two styles as the

reason for their writing.

Aldhelm, the most verbose of the three, announces at the end of his prose *De Virginitate* that he will attempt to write a poetic version of the work which he was just about to finish:

factis iam rethoricis fundamentis at constructis prosae
parietibus, cum tegulis trochaicis et dactylicis metrorum
inbricibus firmissimum culmen caelesti confusus suffragio
impomam.²³

He will only embark on such a difficult task, however, if his prose is acceptable to the muse to whom he is dedicating it, especially since

metrica leporis elegantia et rethoricas disertitudinis
eloquentia tantum aitrinsecum discrepant, quantum distat
dulcia sepa a merulento temeto.²⁴

Very early in the poetic version he resumes this theme of the difference between prose and verse; addressing God, Aldhelm says:

Qui latebras mundi geminato sidere demis;
Nempe diem Titae et noctem Cynthia comit;
Fiscibus aequoreos qui campos pinguis oras
Squamigera formans in glauco gurgite turmas;
Limpida praepetibus sic complens aera catervis,
Garrula quae rostris resonantes cantica pipant
Atque creatorem diversa voce fatentur:
Da plus auxilium clemens, ut carmine possim
Inculta sanctorum modulari geste priorum.²⁵
Ut prius ex prosa laudabat littera castos.

The imagery of this passage revolves around the idea of "geminatus." God created twin heavenly bodies, the sun and the moon; he created twin elements, the water and the air which he filled with "floating" animals. Recognizing this pattern the poet, a "creator" himself, having already praised the virgins *ex prosa*, now wishes to sing their deeds *carmine*.

It is not until the conclusion of the poetic *De Virginitate*, however, that the parallel between the *geminatus sidus* and Aldhelm's *geminus stilus* can be more fully established. Aldhelm takes leave from his readers with these words:

Nunc in fine praecor prosam metrumque legentes.
Hoc opus ut cuncti risuerunt mente benigna,
Dum patulis lustrant textum sub fronte fenestris.
Quod geminum constat discretis ferta libellis.²⁶

The two words *opus*....*geminus* seem to be a deliberate echo of the *geminato sidere* of the introduction; the use of the singular instead of the plural in both word pairs seems to emphasize the parallel.²⁷

Throughout the above quoted passages Aldhelm concentrates on the differences between prose and verse; prose is the walls of the house, verse the roof, one is *dulcis sapa*, the other *serulentum comutum*; one is compared to the sun, the other to the moon; one is water filled with fish, the other air filled with fowl. The images are consistent: each of the items mentioned bears a resemblance to the other in the pair, and yet is different. The implication is that verse and prose are alike (presumably in that they both communicate with words), but that they are also quite different (presumably in their effect and in the methods which they are using).

Neither Bede nor Alcuin are as poetic or as verbose when they give their reasons for duplicating their works. In the prologue to the verse *Vita S. Cuthberti*, Bede briefly announces that he will write another work (without specifying whether it will be prose or verse) because more miracles performed by Cuthbert had come to his attention: "spero me in alio opere conuulsa ex his [gestis], quae praetermissem, memoriae reddiditum."²⁸ In the preface to the prose version he alludes to this promise: "promisi me aliae de uita et miraculis eius latius esse scripturum. Quam uidelicet promissionem in praesenti opusculo... adimpleti satago."²⁹ Again, there is no specific reference to the fact that this second work is in fact prose, unless the word "latius" is interpreted as alluding to Leidorn's definition of prose, which derives it from (1) *prosum* = *prosum* = straightforward; (2) *profusa* = extended; and (3) from the fact "quod spatiosius prouat."³⁰ The term "latius" may thus be used in two senses: it may indicate that additional material has been included in the second version, and that it is written in prose and is therefore more profuse than verse.

This particular reference is inconclusive; Bede's reasons for translating *Paulinus* of Nola's *Vita S. Felicii* from verse to prose, however, contain some very useful information; since *Paulinus*' work, says Bede

Metricis potius quam simplicibus sunt habiles lectoribus, placuit nobis ob plurimum utilitatem, eandem sancti confessoris historiam planioribus dilucidare sermonibus, et uicque imitari industrias qui ueritatem beati Cassiani eloquium transtulit.³¹

The difference between verse and prose is responsible for Bede's writing the prose version; the prose is useful to a greater number of people, it is clearer, it is the common speech which is understood by everyone.

verse, accordingly, is obscure and therefore of little use to the majority of the people.³²

Alcuin presents a similar reason for his writing of a double version:

duos digessi libellos, unum prosaico sermone gradientem, qui pupice fratribus in ecclesia... legi potuisset; alterum Fieroe pede currentem, qui in secreto cubili inter scholasticos tuos tantummodo ruminare debuisset.³³

The prose, which is *gradientem*, can obviously be followed more easily than the verse, which is *currentem*. By addressing the prose to the brothers in the church and the verse to the students in their chambers, Alcuin, like Bede, emphasises the differences between the two styles.

Alcuin's preface to the poem presents the same idea again, but in different words:

Aera minuta duo diuersi ponderis ista, Sancte pater, supplex in tua templa fero. Sed prius res natat planis uulgius figuris, Posterius sed iam Pierum rutilat.³⁴

The *diuersi ponderis* of these lines is reminiscent of Aldhelm's *diuersa uoce*; the *planis figuris* of Bede's *planioribus sermonibus*.

Not one of these three writers claims that, in Colgrave's words, "the same subject could be treated in prose or verse without materially altering the sense." Instead, Bede and Alcuin provide a prose version, because the verse is too difficult for the ordinary audience. Even though Aldhelm does not share this attitude, because his verse seems to be a simplification of his difficult prose, he nonetheless emphasises the difference between the two styles in the images he produces.

The fact that these authors cite the differences between the two styles as the reason for their writing in the *geminus stylus* does not contradict Colgrave's and Curcio's statements, but it does shift the emphasis. Doubtless prose can express the same ideas as verse; however, the writers of the *geminus stylus* works do not set out to prove this contention, and if they prove it, they do so only incidentally.

Important as the statements made by the authors in their prefaces or works are, they only present part of the evidence; a comparison of the content and structure of the prose works with the content and structure of the verse works will determine more accurately to what extent they are supposed to be interchangeable.

Neither of the poetic versions of the three authors is an exact versification of the prose. To be sure, some passages differ only

minimally.³⁵ Even a superficial glance at the prose and verse, however, can determine that they do not entirely consist of such minimally different passages. We read the first two hundred lines of Aldhelm's *Carmen de Virginitate* before we find any extended parallels in the prose. With the exception of chapter 9, the first twenty chapters of the *Prosa de Virginitate* are not paralleled in the beginning of the *Carmen*, chapters 1 to 8 and 14 to 20 have no parallels at all; chapters 11 to 13, from which Aldhelm draws some material for lines 2446-2762 of the *Carmen*, are considerably expanded there, and appear towards the end of the poem, and not towards the beginning as in the prose. All in all, some 400 lines of the total 2904 of the *Carmen* introduce material not found in the prose, and an additional ca. 350 lines expand on ideas proposed only briefly in the prose. Conversely, some 25 of the 60 chapters of the prose are not paralleled in the verse, and an additional 1 chapters differ in content.³⁶

The differences in Bede's two versions are not quite as pronounced. As with Aldhelm, the introduction differs. Moreover, two chapters of the poetry (nos. 6 and 43) have no equivalent in the prose; five chapters in the prose are not paralleled in the poem; an additional three prose chapters (35 to 37) are only summarily hinted at in the poem. In addition to this the order of three chapters is changed; prose chapters 26, 27, 28, 29 correspond to verse chapters 23, 30, 31, 34 and prose chapters 40, 41, 42 correspond to verse chapters 38, 41, and 39.

Similarities of content between Alcuin's prose and verse versions begin with prose chapter 6; only a few minor differences appear after that: prose chapter 11 is not in the poem and chapter 13 of the poem is not in the prose. Alcuin's verse contains, however, one important structural change: prose chapters 1 to 3, which deal with Willibrord's conception and birth, do not appear in the beginning, but at the end of the poem. This structural change is probably made in order to elevate the prose biography or history of Willibrord to an epic. The history narrates the events in the order in which they occur; the poem changes the order by plunging in *ad maiora res*.

As this enumeration of the differences shows, the Anglo-Latin writers add to or subtract from the material of the first version, or they change its order. The differences which appear between the first and second versions suggest that to varying degrees these authors were interested not only in a transference from prose to verse or verse to

prose³⁷ but also in a revision or reworking of the first version.

Aldhelm, Alcuin, and Bede could look back to a large number of writers who preceded them in reworking earlier versions. Arator, Dracontius, Avitus, Juvenius, and Sedulius recast "books of the Bible.. in hexameters";³⁸ Paulinus of Perigueux and Venantius Fortunatus transposed Sulpicius Severus' *Vita S. Martini* into verse;³⁹ Prosper of Aquitaine turned Augustine's *sententiae* into epigrams;⁴⁰ in a letter to Eustochius, St. Jerome mentions that Damasus wrote in praise of virginity in both prose and verse (the title of this work suggests a parallel to Aldhelm's *geminus opus*, but it is no longer extant);⁴¹ Bede mentions an anonymous author who translated Prudentius' *Peristephanon* 9 into prose.⁴² This enumeration of authors and works indicates that most *geminus stilus* writers preceding the Anglo-Latin authors turn a pre-existing prose text into verse; only two, namely Sedulius and possibly Damasus, are responsible for both versions; and only one turns a pre-existing verse into prose.

Obviously not all these writers are equally influential on the Anglo-Latin authors, and therefore I will consider only those for whom a strong influence can be demonstrated.

Bede is one of the first scholars to comment on the connection between Aldhelm and Sedulius: "Scripsit et de virginitate librum eximium, quem in exemplum Sedulii geminato opere at uersibus exornatis et prose composuit."⁴³ About forty verbal parallels⁴⁴ between the *Carmen de Virginitate* and the *Carmen Paschale* make Aldhelm's indebtedness to Sedulius obvious; Aldhelm even quotes six lines of the *Carmen Paschale* at various places in his *Prosa de Virginitate*.⁴⁵ Sedulius subdivides the miracles on which he is writing into Old and New Testament miracles,⁴⁶ a division which Aldhelm seems to follow by separating the Old Testament virgins from those of the New Testament.⁴⁷ Aldhelm may even have imitated the relationship of the prose to the verse style in Sedulius' works: in both the verse is clearer than the prose.⁴⁸ Because of these parallels and echoes of Sedulius' work in Aldhelm, we must look at the reasons which Sedulius gives for writing a *geminus opus*; although Aldhelm does not say that he is writing a *geminus stilus* version for the same reasons which Sedulius gives, he was nonetheless familiar with them and, given all the influences listed above, it would be unlikely that he ignored them.

Sedulius reveals the reasons for writing the *Opus Paschale*, which is the prose version of the *Carmen Paschale*, in a letter addressed to

his friend Macedonius:

Procepiati... paschalis carminis textum... in rhetoricum
me transferre sermonem, utrum quod placeret, ideo geminari
volueris, an quod offenderit, ut potius arbitror, stilo
conversis liberioris describi: sub dubio videor fluctuare
iudicio.⁴⁹

Apparently Macedonius does not indicate whether he was pleased with the Carmen, or whether it had offended him. But why should it offend? Sedulius suggests that the *metrices necessitates angustia*,⁵⁰ forced him to say things which he could say differently in a *stilo...liberioris*, i.e., in prose. Gaston Boissier interprets these lines as follows:

Macedonius, qui était un théologien scrupuleux,
dût être alarmé de voir qu'un homme qui s'appelait lui-même un conscript et un ignorant eût osé toucher à des versifiées si délicates, et (ce qui ajoutait à ses inquiétudes) qu'il les eût traitées en vers. N'était-il pas à craindre que les nécessités de la versification n'eussent forcé quelquefois le poète à trop resserrer ses développements et à mettre des choses essentielles?

I do not think that Macedonius would have been unduly alarmed at Sedulius' calling himself a "freshman and an ignoramus." He surely recognized and accepted this as a modesty topos. The charge present in the second sentence, however, is more serious, and one which Sedulius himself seems to have recognized. Even though he maintains that the prose and verse will not differ "argumento uel ordine" but "stilo...et oratione," he nonetheless concedes that he has omitted "essential material" in the first version and that he wishes to add it in the prose: "quae defuerant primis," he says, "addita sunt secundis."⁵² His prose does, in fact, contain material which is not found in the poetry. Sedulius inserts biblical quotations in the prose which are not in the verse or which are only alluded to. Presumably he does this because the prose can remain faithful to the words of the bible and hence remove him from the "dubio iudicio" under which he found himself after he had completed the Carmen.⁵³ Even though Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin do not claim that they write *geminus opera* in order to avoid accusation of heresy, they definitely know of this fear of Sedulius', and at least Aldhelm is greatly influenced by this writer. The wish to avoid distorting the biblical words must therefore count at least as one possible reason for the writing of the *geminus stilius* works.

The second major influence on Aldhelm appears to be Prosper of Aquitaine, who transposed Augustine's *sententiae* into epigrams. Towards the end of the *Prose de Virginitate* and just before he announces his decision to write a poem on virginity, Aldhelm quotes two of Prosper's

epigrams along with Augustine's *sententiae*.⁵⁴ Although Aldhelm does not expressly say that he will write a Carmen in imitation of Prosper's work, several points suggest that he did. There is, first of all, the proximity between the quotation of Prosper's verses and the statement of Aldhelm's intention to do the same thing - only one page separates the two. Coincidence, maybe. But there is also a verbal echo between the passage in the prose which leads up to Prosper's verses and the passage in the Carmen in which Aldhelm introduces his own versification. In the prose he says: "quod Prosper par cola at comata nullitis versum epigrammaticis indulcavit,"⁵⁵ and in the verse:

En promissa novo scribantur carmina versu!
Carrula virgineas depromat pagina laudes
Colaue cum pedibus pergant et comata tenuis.⁵⁶

And finally: Aldhelm's lines "Hunc igitur raris decerpant carmina flores,"⁵⁷ *quoque virginibus fabricare coronas*⁵⁸ seem to echo Prosper's:

Dum sacris mentes placeat exercere loquellis,
Coelestique animus pascere bene iuvat:
Quodcumq, ceu prato, libuit decerpere flores,
Distinctisque ipsos texere versiculis.⁵⁹

These four lines also give us Prosper's reason for verifying the *sententiae*. Augustine's prose, as the simile suggests, is exercise for the mind and heavenly bread for the soul; the verses, on the other hand, are the flowers which are woven together, presumably to form some kind of wreath or crown. This would mean that the prose represents the "utile" while the verse represents the "iucundum."⁵⁹

The two most important influences on Aldhelm, as far as writing in the *geminus stilius* is concerned, do not, as we have seen, give the interchangeability of prose and verse as their reasons for writing the *geminus opera*. Sedulius seems to fear that his verse strays too far from the actual works of the bible, and Prosper seems to be interested in the charm which verse can give to prose. Like the Anglo-Latin writers who were to follow them, they stress the differences between prose and verse, and not the similarities.

The influences on Bede and Alcuin need not be traced in the same detail as those on Aldhelm. Firstly, Bede and Alcuin place a greater emphasis on the "simplification" of the difficult verse than Aldhelm does; secondly, Bede knew Aldhelm's work and Alcuin knew Bede's.⁶⁰ The later writers are therefore familiar with the reasons given by the earlier ones. And finally, both Alcuin and Bede knew most of the earlier *geminus stilius* writers first hand.⁶¹ A discussion of the influences on these two Anglo-Latin authors would therefore be largely

repetitive, and will not be undertaken here.

The last major area which may answer our question why Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin wrote in the *geminus stilus* is the use to which the *gemmae opere* were put. Only Alcuin states explicitly that his prose would be read publicly to the brothers in the church while the verse should be reserved for the studying of the students. Gerould comments on the fact that the reading of saint's legends formed part "of the service at lectures" and that they were read "in place of sermons or as an addition to sermons."⁶² Alcuin's suggestion to have the prose read in church is thus not unusual, and does not need to be examined here. Comments, are, however, necessary on the use of the *geminus stilus* works in the classroom.

Unlike Alcuin, Bede and Aldhelm do not recommend that their verse be read by students, but it appears that their texts formed part of the curriculum anyway. Ewald says about the *De Virginitate*: "Diligenter in monasteriorum scholis lactatus et in us scholasticum usurpatus sit Aldhelmus."⁶³ Robinson suggests that "there is good reason for assuming that they [Bede's Lives of St. Cuthbert] were [used as school texts]...Bede's *Vitae* treat a single subject in parallel prose and poetic versions, thus offering the student exercise in both forms of expression."⁶⁴ Both Ewald and Robinson base their arguments on the presence of lexical and syntactical glosses in manuscripts containing Bede's and Aldhelm's works.

Schooling in the late Roman Antiquity recommended the paraphrase of poetic texts. Quintilian suggests the paraphrase as a useful exercise for orators,⁶⁵ and St. Augustine mentions in his *Confessiones* that he was forced to translate the texts of pagan poets into prose.⁶⁶ The *gemmae opere* of the Anglo-Latin period seem to offer excellent models for such a paraphrase: the students can see how such eminent writers as Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin translate verse into prose and vice versa. Glosses in manuscripts, which amount to a prose rendition of the verse *lemmata*, indicates that Anglo-Saxon students were indeed expected to paraphrase poetic texts.⁶⁷ The prose paraphrases of the Benedictine hymns in MSS Cotton Julius A vi and Cotton Vespasian D xii reinforce this impression.⁶⁸ On the one hand they helped the Anglo-Saxon students to disentangle the complicated syntax of the verses, on the other they served as models and as a possible correction for students who tried to paraphrase the hymns themselves. It is, therefore, tempting to assume that the *gemmae opere* were written for the

purpose of showing students how to write a good paraphrase, especially since Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin are not only writers but also teachers, as their didactic works show.

This temptation must be resisted, though. Alcuin's directive that the prose be read in the church and the verse in the "secret chamber" stands opposed to the theory that both were read in the school and were used to show the interchangeability of prose and verse. Moreover, the manuscript evidence also seems to contradict such a theory.

Ewald lists twenty-one manuscripts containing Aldhelm's prose, and twenty containing his verse;⁶⁹ not one of these forty-one manuscripts contains both the poem and the prose. This is surprising because Aldhelm considers the prose and verse one work and not two.⁷⁰ I have had access to three manuscripts⁷¹ which contain the poem and not one has any glosses which would clarify the anomaly that Aldhelm mentions "*prosa metrumque*" while the manuscript contains only the "*metrum*"; I have examined eleven manuscripts which contain the prose⁷² and there are no glosses which refer to the Carmen. The fact that both works are never bound together and the lack of glosses referring from the Carmen to the *Prosa* and vice versa suggest that Aldhelm's *geminus stilus* work was not used to demonstrate how verse could be paraphrased in prose or prose in verse.

There are at least five manuscripts⁷³ written prior to the twelfth century which contain both prose and verse *Vitae* by Bede, and therefore they may have been used to demonstrate the interchangeability of prose and verse. However, despite the fact that these manuscripts contain both versions, only one has Old English glosses on both,⁷⁴ while three of them have Old English glosses only on the verse and not on the prose.⁷⁵ The Anglo-Saxon students seem to have needed more help with the verse than with the prose (this is consistent with both Bede's and Alcuin's statements quoted above)⁷⁶ and it may also mean that the Anglo-Saxons concentrated more on Bede's verse than on his prose.⁷⁷

Just the opposite appears to be the case with Alcuin's work. Dümmler says: "*Cum vitae Willibrordi posterior tantum libellus [carmen] ad nostrum prepositum pertinet, cum in libris manuscriptis caeteris praetermissum esse, scribis insipientibus crimini dantes ac maxime dolendum est.*"⁷⁸ Dümmler is a bit harsh with the scribes who probably omitted the second book, not because they were ignorant, but because they wished to or had to transcribe only the text which was designed for reading in church. Of the ten⁷⁹ earliest manuscripts prior

to the twelfth century, four (and not three as in Dümmler) contain both the verse and the prose.⁸⁰ Six manuscripts are therefore not equipped to demonstrate the interchangeability of prose and verse, and this evidence makes the assumption that the remaining four were used in this manner questionable.

All the evidence which I have considered so far, namely, the reasons Aldhelm, Bede, Alcuin, and the writers preceding them give for the duplication of their works; the differences in content and structure between the prose and verse; and the manuscripts containing either or both versions indicate that the gemine opera were not primarily designed to demonstrate that "the same subject could be treated in prose or verse without materially altering the sense" - even though, of course, they do this to a certain extent. Why then do we have Anglo-Latin geminus stilus works?

The answer for this question seems to lie in the rhetorical tradition in which the gemine opera were composed. There can be little doubt that Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin followed the footsteps of the great Christian writers such as Prudentius, Juvenius, Arator, and the others mentioned above.⁸¹ Scruton⁸² and Kloppsch⁸³ outline the dilemma from which these early Christian writers suffered. On the one hand, the book on which their faith was founded was written in a simple style, in so simple a style that the pagans seem to have mocked it. Moreover, the fellow Christians whom these authors addressed came primarily from the lower and less educated classes. Imitation of the language of the Bible and the desire to be understood by one's fellow Christians demanded a "low" style. On the other hand, most early Christian writers had been educated in the pagan schools or at least knew of the rhetorical excellence of a Virgil or an Ovid. Moreover, if they wished to convert the snobbish pagans, they would have to place works of high literary merit beside those of the heathens. And that demanded a "high" style. The dilemma of choosing between the high and the low style was solved differently by various authors: Juvenius and Prudentius, for instance, boldly imitated Virgil⁸⁴ confident that the greatness of their subject gave them the required eloquence. Others, such as Eulpius Severus, excused their lack of eloquence with a passage such as this: "Venerunt enim, saltem veniunt non ab oratoribus,....sed a piscatoribus predicatorum esse."⁸⁵ This dilemma formed part of the Christian rhetorical tradition. The Anglo-Saxons were acquainted with it and had some to terms with it, even though

the situation was slightly changed: the congregation⁸⁶ consisted mainly of the less educated who still required the simple style, especially since Latin was not their native tongue, but the pressure to impress the snobbish Roman pagans was no longer felt.

This pressure seems to have been replaced by another, namely to write something which would be worthy of the excellence of God. This idea was, of course, already known in pre-Anglo-Saxon times: Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*, for instance, gives us one valuable clue that this is indeed the aim that Christian orators (and writers?) had set themselves: "Porro cum laudatur deus sive de se ipso sive de operibus suis, quanta facies pulchrae ac splendidae dictionis oboritur ei qui potest quantum potest laudare, quem nemo convenienter laudet, ei qui potest quantum potest laudare, quem nemo convenienter laudet."⁸⁷ Augustine here argues that anyone who praises God to the best of his ability will obtain the necessary beauty of diction, but he also adds: "nemo [deus] convenienter laudet." This statement becomes a challenge for any writer to try his best.⁸⁸ The Anglo-Latin writer was, therefore, in a dilemma similar to that of his Roman predecessors: in order to be understood by the congregation the style had to be simple; in order to praise God the style had to be as sophisticated as it could be. I am not proposing that the high style necessarily is verse nor that the low style necessarily is prose. We can see in Aldhelm that the prose can be very sophisticated and that the verse can be relatively simple. I am here only interested in the dichotomy of "high" and "low" style, which seems to be paralleled in the use of prose and verse.

The ideal solution for this dilemma was the geminus stilus: by writing both, the "high" and the "low" style, the author sacrificed neither clarity nor beauty, but simply separated them. By isolating, as Aldhelm does, that both the verse and the prose form one work, he re-combined them. The conclusion to be drawn from this is not that the gemine opera were written to exemplify "the interchangeability of metrical and non-metrical discourse," but that the prose was written to complement the verse and the verse was written to complement the prose.

Evidence for this view that the two styles are indeed complementary is not difficult to find. Sedulius, for instance, says: "aliud namque est mutare composita et aliud integrare non plena," and his sentence "quae defuerunt prius additis sunt vermicis"⁸⁹ indicates that he is indeed intent on "integrare non plena." Aldhelm's image of

the walls of the prose and the roof of the poetry also suggests complementarity rather than interchangeability; and both Bede's and Alcuin's concern for the unsophisticated audience points to their desire to sacrifice neither clarity nor sophistication, but to emphasize the first in the prose and the second in the verse.

Since this pattern of two books, one of which complements the other, is so basic to Christianity with its Old and New Testament, I wonder whether it has contributed to the writing of the *geminus stilus*. Of course, the Old and New Testaments differ in content, whereas the *geminus* opens do so only to a limited extent. This objection can be countered in part, because, as typology informs us, the content of the Old Testament is often made parallel to that of the New Testament.⁹⁰ Moreover, speaking about the Old and New Testaments, Aldhelm uses the words "*geminum fœdus legum*" (v.1641) where the word "*geminum*" is perhaps deliberately chosen to echo the "*opus...geminum*." In the absence of any clearer evidence, the duality of Old and New Testament as an influence on the *geminus stilus* works must remain a speculation. It may, however, be worth pursuing.

One final speculation: scholars have long puzzled over Aelfric's rhythmic prose⁹¹ to the extent that some have published his saint's lives as though they were prose⁹² and others as though they were poetry.⁹³ They clearly are both, but cuneated to such an extent that they cannot be separated. Perhaps Aelfric brings the *geminus stilus* to its logical conclusion in these works: rather than two works on the same subject, one in verse and one in prose, he writes only one in which he combines both styles.

NOTES

¹ Hrabanus Maurus, *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*, FL 107: 265. "It was a custom among the ancients to compose their works in a twofold style, so that their works would be more pleasing and more useful to their readers. Hence many are found both among secular and ecclesiastical writers who wrote on one and the same subject in metre and prose. What else did Prosper and that venerable man Sedulius do, not to mention any others?...Following their example...I, too, though the most worthless of men, have taken pains to translate the metrical version in praise of the holy cross into prose."

² *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii Philosophiae Consolatio*, ed. L. Bieler, CCSL 94 (Turnhout, 1957). For a comment on the term "*prosimetrum*" see E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask, Bollingen Series 36 (Princeton, 1973), p. 151.

³ *Aucassin et Nicolette: chantefable du XIII^e siècle*, ed. Mario Roques, Les classiques français du moyen âge, 41 (Paris, 1936).

⁴ In writing a *geminus stilus* version of the *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*, Hrabanus may have wished to follow Alcuin's double version of the *Vita S. Willibrordi*. The close connection between these two men is documented by the *Intercessio Alhadi pro Mauro* which is prefixed to the *De Laudibus S. C.* (see FL 107: 137).

⁵ The Latin writers of Anglo-Saxon England are here called Anglo-Latin writers. The term as used in this paper does not include Latin writers of a later period of English history.

⁶ Aldhelm, *De Virginitate*, ed. R. Ewald, *MED Ant. Ant.* 15 (Berklin, 1919); prose pp. 228-323; poetry pp. 350-471.

⁷ Bede's prose *Life* is found in B. Colgrave, ed. *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life* (Cambridge, 1939; New York, 1969), pp. 141-307. The verse *Life* is edited by W. Jæger, *Bedes metrische Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, *Faksimile* 198 (1935).

⁸ Bede, *Beati Felicis Confessoris Vita*, FL 94: 789-98.

⁹ Alcuin, *Vita Sancti Willibrordi*; poem: ed. E. Dümmler, *MED Font. Lat.* 1 (Berlin, 1881): 208-20. Prose: ed. W. Levison, *MED MON.* 7 (Göttingen and Leipzig, 1920): 81-141.

¹⁰ *Sancti Pontii Marcelli Paulini Nolani Carmine*, ed. W. V. Hertel, *CSEL* 30:2 (Vienna, 1894); the major poems on Felix are on pp. 42-81.

- 11 B. Colgrave, "The Earliest Saints' Lives Written in England," *MLA* 44 (1958), esp. pp. 45-49.
- 12 Curtius, pp. 147-48.
- 13 P. Klopsch, "Prosa und Vers in der mittellateinischen Literatur," *MLA* 3 (1946): 9-24.
- 14 G. Strunk, *Kunst und Glaube in der lateinischen Heiligenlegende. Zu ihrem Selbstverständnis in den Prologomen, Medium Aevum: Philologische Studien*, 12 (Munich, 1970).
- 15 Curtius, p. 147.
- 16 Curtius, p. 148.
- 17 Klopsch, p. 10: "Aus der Erbmasse der antiken Literaturtheorie sind dem Mittelalter zwei Anschauungen über das Verhältnis von Prosa und Vers zugekommen: Erstens die, dass die Poesie zeitlich älter sei und in Wert über stehe als die ungebundene Rede, zweitens, dass gebundene und ungebundene Rede beliebig miteinander vertauschbar seien."
- 18 Strunk, p. 15.
- 19 Colgrave, "The Earliest Saints' Lives," p. 46. See also his note on p. 114 f. in his edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), where he uses almost the same words.
- 20 See n. 11.
- 21 Colgrave, "The Earliest Saints' Lives," p. 46.
- 22 Curtius, p. 148.
- 23 Aldhelm, *De Virginitate*, ed. Ehwald, p. 321: "The rhetorical foundation stones were now laid and the walls of prose were built, as I trochaic staves and dactylic tiles of metre." trans. M. Lapidge in: M. Lapidge and M. Herren, trans., *Aldhelm: The Prose Works* (Cambridge, 1978), p. 131.
- 24 Ibid.: "The elegance of metrical beauty and the eloquence of rhetorical disquisition differ as much from each other as sweet new wine is different from heady brandy."
- 25 Aldhelm, *MGH Auct. Ant.*, 15: 352-53, lines 10-19: "You take away and Cynthia the night; you adorn the watery plains with fat fish, you create scaly schools in the planning sea. In the same manner you fill songs with their beaks and praise the creature with manifold gurgles no help, a gentle loving lord, so that I can now sing in a poem the famous deeds of the saints of former times, just as previously my work has praised the chaste ones in prose."

- 26 Aldhelm, *MGH Auct. Ant.*, 15: 469, lines 2867-70: "Now in the end I ask all the readers of the prose and verses to show favour to this twofold work which happens to be written down in separate books, when they peruse it with their open eyes."
- 27 *Geminus, geminatus*, and *geminus* appear twenty times in the *Carmen de Virginitate* (lines 10, 254, 318, 321/22, 715, 763, 831, 959, 1077/78, 1097, 1211, 1354, 1641, 1876, 2271, 2279, 2357, 2661, 2870); Aldhelm uses the singular only four times (lines 10, 831, 1211, 2870).
- 28 Jaeger, p. 57. "In another work I hope to write down for posterity some of the deeds which I have here omitted."
- 29 Colgrave, *Two Lives*, pp. 146-47: "I promised that I would write more fully on another occasion about his life and miracles, and in the present work I am striving to fulfill that same promise."
- 30 Isidore of Seville, *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), 1:38.
- 31 Fl. 94: 786b. "They are manageable more to readers learned in prosody than to the simple sort; it has [therefore] pleased me, for the utility of the majority, to make evident the same life of the holy confessor in plainer discourse, and to imitate the industry of him who translated the martyrdom of blessed Cassian from the actual work of Prudentius into discourse common and plain to all." (translation from W. F. Bolton, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature* 397-1066, 1: 597-740 [Princeton, 1967], p. 139).
- 32 The "people" here refers to the monks and the clergy, since they were most likely the only ones to understand Latin.
- 33 Alcuin, *MGH SSF* 7: 113. "I have written two little books: the first walks in prosaic words, which can be read publicly to the brethren in the church...the second runs swiftly on Pictian feet and ought to be muffled over in a secret chamber by your students."
- 34 Alcuin, *MGH Post. Lat.*, 1: 209, lines 15-18. "Holy Father, I humbly carry into your temple these two small coins of different weight. The first one retains the imprint in plain figures, while the second reflects the form of the Muses."
- 35 Compare, for instance, Aldhelm, lines 248-82 of the poem with pp. 249-50 of the prose. Bolton juxtaposes two passages from Bede on p. 137.
- 36 See the notes in Ehwald which collect the chapters of the prose with the lines of the verses.
- 37 Aldhelm and Alcuin write the prose work first and then turn it into verse; Bede turns either pre-existing verses (*Vita S. Paulini*) or verses written by him (*Vita S. Guthberti*) into prose.
- 38 Curtius, p. 148. The editions for these authors are: Aldhelm, *CHSL* 72; Brunetto Latini, *MGH Auct. Ant.*, 13-153, *Avellan, MGH Auct. Ant.*, 6.2: 201-94; Juvencius, *CHSL* 24; Sedulius, *CHSL* 10.

³⁹The editions for these authors are: Paulinus of Perigord, CSEL 16; Venantius Fortunatus, MGH Auct. Ant., 4: 1; Sulpicius Severus, CSEL 1.

⁴⁰Prosper of Aquitaine, *Epigrammatum ex Sententiis S. Augustini*; Liber, PL 51: 497-532.

⁴¹S. Hieronymus, *Epistola ad Eustochium*, PL 22: 409: "et Papae Domestici super hac re [de virginitate] versus, prosaque composita."

⁴²See above, n. 31.

⁴³Beda's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. Bertram Colgrave and K. A. B. Myers (Oxford, 1969), p. 514. "He also wrote a most excellent book on virginity both in hexameter verse and in prose, producing a twofold work after the example of Sedulius" (p. 515).

⁴⁴See the notes in Ethelwald, *passim*.

⁴⁵These quotations appear on pp. 232, 249, 250, and 284.

⁴⁶The Old Testament miracles end at line 290 of book 1 of the *Carmina*, and with chapter 28 of book 1 of the *prose*.

⁴⁷Aldhelm has completed the enumeration of Old Testament virgins at line 390 of the *Carmina*, and at the end of Ch. 21 in the *prose*.

⁴⁸With this statement I do not wish to contradict Michael Winterbottom's findings in "Aldhelm's Prose Style and Its Origins" in *ASE* 6 (1977): 39-76. There is, however, a marked parallel in that the poetry is easier to read than the prose. See also G. Boissier, "Le Carmin Paschale et l'Opus Paschale de Sedulius," *Revue de Philologie* N. S. 6 (1967): 30; Ainet, il est vrai qu'il se souvient la langue de la prose était beaucoup moins simple, moins correcte, plus corrompue que celle des vers." And: "Les vers sont beaucoup plus simple et plus aisés à comprendre que la prose." (p. 29).

⁴⁹Sedulius, CSEL 10: 171. "You have commanded me to translate the text of the *Carmin Paschale* into prose. I am plagued by doubts as to whether you wished to see the work written in a twofold style because it has pleased you, or whether you have decided to have it written in a freer style because it has offended you, so I am inclined to suspect."

⁵⁰Sedulius, CSEL 10: 172.

⁵¹Boissier, p. 28.

⁵²Sedulius, CSEL 10: 173.

⁵³Compare, for instance, book 2, chapter 7 of the *prose* with lines 73-88 of book 2 of the *poem*.

⁵⁴Aldhelm, ed. Ethelwald, pp. 318-19.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 319: "which Prosper made sterner in the honeyed epigrams of his verses, using half-verse and caesurae."

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, let the promised songs be written in new verse, let the garulous page sing the praise of the virgins, and let the caesurae and the half-verses with their three feet issue forth."

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 358, lines 138-39: "Now let our songs pick rare flowers from which they may fashion crowns for the virgins."

⁵⁸PL 51: 497-98. "As long as it was pleasing to exercise the mind with holy sayings, and as long as we took delight in feeding the heart with heavenly bread, it pleased us to pick some flowers, as if from a meadow, and to weave them together in separate verses."

⁵⁹Cf. Hrabanus' introduction to his *prose De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*. See n. 1.

⁶⁰For Alcuin's knowledge of Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti* see lines 684-86 of the *Versus de Sanctis Suboricensis Ecclesiae*, MGH Poet. Lat., 1: 184:

Omnia quae dudum praeclarus Beda sacerdos
Prosaice prius scriptis sermones magister,
Et post heroice cecinit miracula versus.

⁶¹On books which were known to the Anglo-Saxons, see J. D. A. Ogilvy, *Books Known to the English*, 597-1066, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967); for influences especially on Bede and Aldhelm see H. Manitius, "Zu Aldhelm und Bede," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 122 (Wien, 1886): 535-634.

⁶²G. Ceroult, *Saints' Legends* (Boston, 1916), p. 14.

⁶³MGH Auct. Ant. 15: 215.

⁶⁴F. C. Robinson, "Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Prose," *Speculum* 48 (1973): 463. See also M. Lapidge, "The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature," *ASE* 4 (1975): 75, on the use of Aldhelm in the classroom.

⁶⁵Quintilian's *Institutio de Oratoria* or *Education of an Orator*, trans. J. S. Watson (London, 1902), p. 293: "But the conversation of Latin trans. J. S. Watson will also be of great service to us. About writing into other words will also be of great service to us. About the utility of turning poetry into prose, I suppose that no one has any doubt." (=I. O. 10.5.4).

⁶⁶The *Confessiones* of St. Augustine, ed. J. G. Gibb and W. Moor-rogue (Cambridge, 1927), 1: 17: "sed figmentorum poetarum caecis errantibus sequi cogamur et tale aliquid dicere salutis verbum, quale poete dixissent verbis."

⁶⁷See G. Wieland, *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in University Library, Cambridge*, MS Gy. 5.35, Diss. (Tübingen, 1976), esp. pp. 316-18.

⁶⁸Edited by E. Gieseler, *Byzanz und Rom in englischen Mittelalter*. Buchreihe der Anglia: Zeitschrift für englische Philologie, 12 (Tübingen, 1868): 261-413.

- ⁶⁴MS. Auct. Ant., 15: 225 for the prose and p. 349 for the verse.
- ⁷⁰See Aldhelm's text above and n. 26 of this paper; he says "hoc opus" and not "hanc opera."
- ⁷¹There are CCC MS 285; Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Rawlinson C 497; Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 577 (27645).
- ⁷²These manuscripts are: BL MS Royal 5E xi; BL MS Royal 6A vi; BL MS Royal 6B vii; BL MS Royal 7D xiv; BL MS Harley 3013; Bodleian Library, MS Digby 146 (19747); Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 97 (1928); Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 49 (1946); Salisbury Cathedral MS 38, CCC MS 328; Hereford Cathedral MS F.I.xvii.
- ⁷³These manuscripts are: BL Cotton Vitellius A xix; BL Harley 1117; Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 109 (1962); CCC 183; Bodleian Library, MS Digby 175 (1776).
- ⁷⁴Namely, MS BL Cotton Vitellius A xix.
- ⁷⁵All of these mentioned in n. 73 except MS Digby 175 (1776).
- ⁷⁶See pp. 116-17.
- ⁷⁷Jager, *Medien metrische Pits sanoti Cuthberti*, pp. 24-32 contains a list of manuscripts of the verse. There are ten altogether, prior to the twelfth century.
- ⁷⁸MS. Post Lat. 1: 163.
- ⁷⁹Stuttgart, Public Library MS xiv, 1, formerly Weingarten 1630; Codex Traverensis, bibl. urb. MS 1834; Codex Monacensis Latinus n. 4605 and n. 18934; Codex Sangallensis 565; Wirsiburgensis Mp. th. f. 34; Codex Parisiensis 10065 and 3294; Codex Berlinensis Lat. n. 121; Codex Alantoniensis n. 14.
- ⁸⁰Stuttgart, bibl. publ. xiv, 1; Codex Sangallensis 565; Wirsiburgensis Mp. th. f. 34, and Codex Alantoniensis n. 14.
- ⁸¹p. 119.
- ⁸²Strunk, pp. 13-26.
- ⁸³Elloppch, pp. 11-13.
- ⁸⁴For Juvenius, see lines 9-23 of the *Evangeliorum Libri Quattuor*; and for Prudentius see his *Psychomachie* with its Vergilian echoes.
- ⁸⁵Sulpicius Severus, CSEL 1: 109.
- ⁸⁶See n. 32.
- ⁸⁷St. Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, 4.19.16: "Again, when God is praised either on His own account or because of His works, what an appearance of beautiful and splendid diction arises in him who praises Him as he is able, when no one praises adequately and when no one in one way or another fails to praise." (Translation from St.

- Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, The Library of Liberal Arts, trans. D. W. Robertson Jr., [Indianapolis, 1958], p. 146; Cf. CSEL 80: 146.)
- ⁸⁸For English monastic circles the "best" was probably imitation of the works of the early Christian writers, the Psalms, and the hymns, some of which are metrical saints' lives.
- ⁸⁹CSEL 10: 172-73.
- ⁹⁰Thus Christ is the "second Adam": Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac corresponds to God the Father's of His Son. See H. Auerbach, "Figure" *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (New York, 1959).
- ⁹¹E. G., M. McC. Catch, *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Aelfric and Wulfstan* (Toronto, 1977), p. 15. "This [Aelfric's] style is thought by some to be imitative of late Latin rhymed prose; but in general, efforts to find stylistic sources for Aelfric's work have failed to perceive its real genius."
- ⁹²Aelfric, *Lives of Three English Saints*, ed. G. I. Hoadham (London, 1966).
- ⁹³E. G., *Aelfric's Lives of Saints*, EETS 76, 82, 94, 114, ed. W. M. Skeat (London, 1881).

ALCUIN'S GRAMMAR VERSE: POETRY AND TRUTH IN CAROLINGIAN PEDAGOGY

Colin Chase

University of Toronto

In recent years, a marked tendency towards deductive analysis has characterized Alcuinian studies. The purpose of the deduction has been to abstract from Alcuin's work a systematic treatment of areas of human thought which he dealt with only implicitly or casually. Thus, in 1959, Luitpold Wallach in *Alcuin and Charlemagne*¹ outlined a political philosophy based on his analysis of the *Dialogus de Rhetorica et Virtutibus*, though Alcuin purported to be treating only the subject implied by his title, that is, the essential nature and manner of acquisition of the art of rhetoric and the four cardinal virtues. Again, in 1965, Wolfgang Edelstein in *Eruditio und Sapientia* concentrated on the letters in order to deduce a sociology for Alcuin and his period.² Finally, in 1978, W. Y. Bolton in *Alcuin and Beowulf* compiled references, drawn from the whole corpus, but principally from the exegetical commentary, the *didascalia*, and the polemical writing, to construct a theory of literary criticism according to which Alcuin might have read *Beowulf*.³

The deductive character of these investigations does not invalidate them. Although Edelstein's methodology would have been foreign to Alcuin or anybody of his time, in my opinion, the conclusions drawn are thoroughly consonant with the period, for the author carefully and consistently distinguishes between attitudes implicit in his analytic method and attitudes which might conceivably have belonged to the Carolingians themselves. Thus, there is no implication in Edelstein's study that Charlemagne and his court would have been any more interested than the Hatfields and the McCoyes in the minutiae of sociological analysis.

Insular Latin Studies, ed. Michael Herren.

Papers in Mediaeval Studies 1 (Toronto:
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981)
pp. 135-152

The same, regrettably, cannot be said for the others: the very statement that Alcuin had a political theory or a theory of literary criticism which might be applied to secular vernacular verse involves presuppositions respecting the uses of power and the enjoyment of beauty in Carolingian Europe which I suspect are largely anachronistic. The process of deductive analysis, in these instances, devolves into a search for hints and fragments to satisfy the intellectual curiosities of our own time and not to discover Alcuin's.

For the literary scholar this turn of events is alarming. When the solid sober Wissenschaft of our more learned cousins in history and the social sciences becomes tinged with this kind of subjectivity, what is to become of us? "If they do these things in the green wood, what will they do in the dry?" For many years now, we in literature have existed comfortably enough with an approach to Alcuin's poetry which, if not wholly modern, is at least Victorian in outline. We have anthologized, translated, and commented frequently upon four poems: the "Farewell to His Cell," the "Elegy for a Nightingale," the "Debate Between Winter and Spring," and the "Epitaph," despite a nagging doubt that the first (possibly), the third (probably), and the last, (given the circumstances), are likely not to have been written by Alcuin at all.⁴ Beyond these four, we generally acknowledge the importance of the poem on the church at York - particularly with reference to its list of authors represented in the library there - the versified life of Willibrod, and the poem on the destruction of Lindisfarne, not because they are to be admired as literature, but because they relate to Alcuin's biography, to the intellectual life of the times, to its missionary activity, and to the history of the Viking invasions.⁵ Such reasons are excellent, but they do not put us in touch with Alcuin's sense of what he was about in the composition of poetry. Such reasons also explain why we more often know about these poems than read them.

But even when we discuss the poems we read and reread, there is an inescapable impression that we read them with concerns and preoccupations more appropriate to our modern than their medieval setting. For example, Peter Dale Scott in an article of 1964 entitled "Alcuin as a Poet: Rhetoric and Belief in his Latin Verse," applies a subtle intellect and a sensitive ear to appreciating principally the "Farewell to His Cell" and the "Elegy for a Nightingale."⁶ Beginning with the hypothesis that at given periods in history style becomes fixed and ceases to express interior attitudes, Scott goes on to describe the

character of his interest in Alcuin's poetry:

To harmonize our inner and outer habitations, a readjustment of rhetoric and belief is called for. This occurred, for example, during the Romantic Revival, and many have called for it in our time. I propose to study Alcuin, not just as a poet in his own right, but as an example of such a readjustment. In his age as in our own, language, the great conservative medium of a culture (in which all is convention and only the habitual survives) had become a problematic and challenging link with a largely alienated past.⁷

The comparison is tempting. Just as Wordsworth in the preface to the second (1800) edition of *The Lyrical Ballads* had called for a return to "the very language of men" and for greater freedom and simplicity in poetic language, Alcuin demonstrably wrote poetry in which he "effectively censored out the rhetorical overworking, the penchant for the antheron plasma or flowery style" which characterized so much of the poetry in the tradition he inherited.⁸ The comparison, as I say, is tempting, until one recollects the basic facts of Alcuin's linguistic context. Alcuin wrote Latin verse. During his life he lived successively at York, Aachen, and Tours, where "the language of men" was Old English, Frankish, and an Italic dialect no longer recognizable as Latin. In fact, less than a decade after Alcuin's death at Tours, a council meeting at that place decreed that bishops were to translate their humilies into *rustica romana lingua* or into Germanic so they could be understood.⁹ In such a historical and linguistic context, the comparison with England of the Romantic Revival becomes equivocal, for while the romantics were declaring their independence of both tradition and the classroom, Alcuin's clarity and simplicity were part of a re-emphasis on both the tradition of Donatus and Priscian and the necessity for constant academic exercise to master the universal language of western Europe and the church. There is much that is valuable in Scott's article, but much of that value is vitiated by the presumption that Alcuin's attitude towards rhetorical tradition was something like Wordsworth's.

Such a romantic stance - that poetry defines itself through opposition to the traditions and culture of its own society - influences not only the poems we select to read and the way we describe their historical content but also the way we understand these poems. Myra Whitfield's 1973 article on the *Farewell to His Cell* is a good example.¹⁰ In this description of the poem's strategy, the poet "is led astray by the gloomy thoughts and feelings induced by preoccupation with this world, until his very excess and intensity - his explicit rejection of

belief in stability and permanent values - appear to shock him into renewed awareness and affirmation of his Christian faith. Finding himself, he returns to the Way and the Life.¹¹ In this reading, the poet's absorption with the vanity and evanescence of life represents a kind of nihilism, expressed most completely in the couplet:

*Nil unum aeternum, nihil immutabile vere est
Obscurat sacrum nos tenebrae diem.* (25-26)

This gives way finally to a reaffirmation of faith in God, "Pectore quae pariter toto laudamus, amamus," not by a linear extension of the process of reflection, but by a reversal stimulated by the sudden realization that he has wandered so far from the paths of faith. This is much like Keats' realization in the famous nightingale ode, where - enchanted and "half in love with easy Death" from listening to the bird's song - the poet is similarly recalled by a sudden thought:

*Forlorn! the very word is like a bell
To toll me back from thee to my sole self!
Adieu! the fancy cannot cheat so well
As she is fabled to do, deceiving elf.* (71-74)

In both Keats' ode and in Myra Whitfield's interpretation of the "Versus ad Callum," poetry is an inevitable tension with the traditional values of culture. It is a siren sound, inviting the poet to a thrilling but potentially dangerous encounter with mysterious and irrational forces. This interpretation expresses clearly and forcefully the sort of values our generation has looked for in its verse. Such values are, in my view, wholly contrary not only to the ordinary attitudes of the time, but also to Alcuin's explicitly enunciated goals and aspirations. The identification of some of these central, controlling aspirations is a primary objective of this paper.

My premise, then, is that we can better understand not only the mind of Alcuin but also any given product of that mind if we begin by examining work more closely related to his central preoccupations than to ours. The verse associated with his lifelong commitment to pedagogy provides a convenient expression of these preoccupations, though this verse has to be clarified with reference to the pedagogical prose works of which they are frequently a part. To call this verse "grammar poetry" may seem perverse, but the expression is an attempt to avoid distortion by using his concept rather than ours, for in Alcuin's day the classical notion that *grammatici* were *poetarum interpretes* or *explanatores* was still current.¹² At the same time, grammar had some of the association with the fundamentals of education it still has,

without the restrictive, pejorative connotation deriving from its later status as the first and lowest of the arts of the trivium, a word which does not appear for more than a century after Alcuin's day. In his time, while grammar was considered the first of the seven liberal arts,¹³ its cultivation was not limited to any one phase of education, but provided the basic methodology for all of them. Thus, knowledge was considered to consist in natural, moral, and rational science, called respectively *Physica*, including the arts later called the *quadrivium*; *Ethica*, including the four cardinal virtues; and *Logica*, or rational science, including rhetoric and dialectic but not grammar, for grammar was held to be a constituent element of all the sciences. Hence, the term "grammar poetry," which implies both the interpretation of poetry and the investigation of first principles.¹⁴

While this overview gives an accurate notion of the way the Carolingians conceived the different branches of learning to be related, in practical terms, most of the time was apparently spent in the last-mentioned branch, *Logica*, or rational science. Furthermore, this was accomplished at the same time as the arts of liturgical singing and calligraphy were being pursued, so that students would be sent off in groups to the chantry, the scriptorium, or to a lectio master, who - as I understand it - would drill them in the progressive acquisition of the liberal arts.¹⁵ The poetry I am looking at relates to these day-to-day practical and pedagogical activities at which Alcuin spent his life.

A convenient example is offered by the first two lines of the versified prologue to Alcuin's *De Dialectica*:

*Me lege, qui veterum cupis arguere sensus,
Me quicumque capit, rusticitate caret.*¹⁶

"The one that understands me is without....what? Rusticity!" Today, that might not seem a very inviting promise. A book promising to relieve its readers of rustic charm does not promise much. For Alcuin, however, *rustici*, or people from the *pagus* or country or in his native category as *pagani*, or people from the *pagus* or country or in his native Old English the *beothan* or "health-dwellers" - all of them living in darkness, all of them a little suspect and somewhat alien for reasons strikingly similar to those for which, by contrast, the early nineteenth century began to find country people and country places so charming; that is, because both the people and the places seemed very much as nature had made them. Isidore of Seville explains, "*rustici* are so

named because they remain just as they were *gentis*," which for him meant "just as in the flesh they have descended under the power of sin, serving idols and not yet regenerated."¹⁷ The process of education was, then, as a process by which man in his natural state, *rudis* and *indoctus*, is brought to *eruditio* and *doctrina*. It was parallel to and partly identified with the process which brought the unbaptized to a rebirth in Christ. Now different is this attitude to education from that implied in Wordsworth's "Immortality Ode," in which the uninstructed child is addressed as "Best Philosopher..."

Mighty Prophet! Hear blest:
On whom those truths do rest
Which we are toiling all our lives to find (110,114-16)

The contrast is not random or fortuitous. Dominated by a post-romantic sense of the function of poetry, we have chosen to read those poems of Alcúnia which concern nature, natural scenery, and the relations between man and nature. We have, moreover, brought to them a post-industrial preoccupation with the alienation of man from his natural surroundings. In both instances we have inevitably distorted Alcúnia's meaning. For him, *ruralidades* was never a positive word.¹⁸

Some sense of the major concerns which do appear to have occupied Alvin can be gained by a brief look at the short poem he appended to his *Dialogues de Rhetorica et Virtutibus*. The poem suggests what Alvin feels to be among the chief difficulties and the chief rewards of a life of study:

vos, est et aë, livens, quibus apta legendæ,
Discitis: cumq; laus, nec non flammæ aquas.
Acque ditiæ dociles, vacuis se perdita rebus:
Nac refit unde flumens, nac refit unde riuus,
Floreat in studiis victus prima Iuvenalis,
Pulsat et magno laetitia honoris amem,
Utrem, quicquid lætas livens honoris amem,
Auctoritate memur di: "misereor deus."
Ii matrem, lector, festinus tellure quare,
Abora de proprio luctu tollere quare,
Duce tuas, juvenis, ut aq; famula causas,
De sis delinctor, cura, salagatq; causas,
Duce, prator, juvenis, notus moribus vanueto,
laudatur toto ut omnia in orbem tuis.

A persistent concern apparent in this poem, as in many of Alcuin's is the swift passage of time. The fourth line, based on a couplet of Ovid's, is a favourite of Alcuin's, appearing again and again in his verse.²⁰ In the verses written apparently to dedicate the walls of a church, he makes a plea much like that just quoted:

Instruct in studiis iuvenum bona tempora doctor,
Nam fugiunt anni more fluentis aequae.²¹
or again in the verses added to his commentary on Ecclesiastes, he
laments:

Omnis fluxa fluunt saeculorum gaudia longe
Nec redeunt iterum more fluentis aquae.²²

This preoccupation with the swift passage of time and with the mutability of human joy is not surprising in a man of this period, and certainly not in an Englishman, the poetry of whose native land is so filled with similar concern. What is, perhaps, a little disconcerting is his insistence on the topic in this particular context. His educational poems, the "grammar poetry" of my title, return to the theme with even greater regularity than the broad range of his verse. Why?

Why?

The answer, I believe, is to be found in the central passage of Alcibi's dialogue-Introduction to his *De Grammatica*, in which master and student seek an answer to the age-old question: "What is true happiness?" and, "What is true wisdom?" As the dialogue proceeds, familiar ground is covered. True happiness cannot consist in anything exterior, for these cannot be securely possessed. Nor can it consist in any delight of mine which depends on such things. "Quid pulchrius lucet?" says the master: "at haec tenebris succedentibus obducatur. Quid floribus venustius aestat? qui tamen hiemalibus frigoribus pereunt. Quid salute corporis suavis? at quis hanc perpetuum habere confidit?... Si coelum terraque suis semper vicinistatibus mutantur... quanto magis quilibet rei specialis delectatio transierit esse necesse est."²³ As the dialogue proceeds, it becomes clear that the one possession which one may keep despite external circumstances is sapientia. Here is the root of true happiness, for this is not subject to the same laws of change and decay as other things. At this point the dialogue begins to take a new turn, for the question of the soul's immortality is raised. To the question as to whether the soul's wisdom endures along with the soul, the master answers, "Is it not unreasonable that the soul should endure without that which makes it beautiful and worthy? Therefore it appears that both are everlasting."²⁴

At this point the student begins to question his master about the acquisition of this wisdom, which is both perfect guarantor of happiness and not subject to change. In response, the master quotes from

the Book of Proverbs: "Wisdom built herself a house; she fashioned seven columns,"²³ and goes on. "Quae sententia licet ad divina pertinent Septentim, quae sibi in utero virginali domus, id est corpus, edificavit, hanc et septem donis sancti Spiritus confirmavit: vel Ecclesiam, quae est domus Dei, eadem donis illuminavit, tamen Sapientia liberalium litterarum septem columnis confirmatur; nec aliter ad perfectam quolibet deducta scientiam, nisi his septem columnis vel etiam gradibus exaltetur".²⁶

Thus, in Alcuin's pedagogy, the perception that time's swift chariot carries all before it does not represent a temptation to despair nor a statement of the meaninglessness of existence but the rational principle and motive for the attainment of learning. As we have seen, Alcuin identifies progress through academic learning as a necessary condition for attaining wisdom; at the same time, such wisdom is also identified with the state of the blessed soul after death. The conclusion to be drawn is not that Alcuin had devised a sort of academic Pelagianism (his doctrine of grace was sufficiently Augustinian to protect him from that), but rather that, in his time, scholarship and ultimate truth were more closely and optimistically identified with one another than they have often been since, and, perhaps more important, that reflection on the fickle quality of human happiness is more likely to be evidence of faith than despair in Alcuin.

In the context of the poem we were considering, the references to the passage of time fulfil the same kind of function that the thoughts of earthly mutability do in the preface to the *De Grammatica*, that is, they are a spur to activity and a warning against wasteful idleness:

Atque diu dociles vocis ne perditis rabus;
Nec redit unde fluens, nec redit hora ruens.²⁷

The difference is that the poem is not as explicitly concerned with the soul's eternal destiny as with praise and honour in a man's later years. The two were not unconditionally compatible with one another: in the preface to the *De Grammatica*, the master tells his student: "Est equidem facili viam vobis demonstrare sapientiae, et sem tantummodo propter Deum, propter puritatem animae, propter veritatem cognoscendam, etiam et propter seipsum diligatis; et non propter humanam laudem, vel honorem saeculi, vel etiam divitiarum fallaces voluptates."²⁸ At the same time, the two were not wholly antithetical. In this poem, Alcuin both asks for prayers for his own soul, "Auctoritasque memor dic: 'Misereere domine,'" and at the same time twice recommends the praise of

men, first as the reward of a wise old age, then as the natural result of virtue learned in youth. Alcuin did not see any obvious contradiction between a serious Christian commitment and a reasonable respect for the opinion of men. In the concluding section of the preface to the *De Grammatica* he notes, after naming the seven liberal arts, that with their help the philosophers became more famous than kings,²⁹ and in an epigram ascribed to him he comments on the immortality of poets:

Vivere post mortem vates vix nosse vistor?
Quod legis ecce loquor, vox tua tempus mea est.³⁰

To me, this epigram expresses a beautiful balance between the human attraction and the ultimate fragility of earthly fame.

The references in this couplet to man as pilgrim or wayfarer points to the imaginative nucleus about which much of Alcuin's thought revolved. To him and to his contemporaries this world was seen, not only as a "faire that passeth soone as floures faire" but also as a journey home from exile, the direction and milestones for which were plotted by application to the study principally of the first three of the liberal arts, of scripture, and the fathers. These things assured that the one thing necessary, ultimate understanding and eternal happiness, would be salvaged from the all-consuming power of time.

But to accomplish this one needs texts. Exposure to the word, both sacred and secular, would ensure the journey could be accomplished, but who was to guarantee that the word itself would survive the Heraclitean fire unscorched by time and unobscured by human ignorance or perversity? An anxious concern that man's ultimate happiness depends on such fragile, corruptible things as a good knowledge of syntax, clear articulation, a good pen, and dark ink goes far towards explaining the nagging, querulous note that whines through so many of Alcuin's letters and epistolary poems: "Whatever you may think of this page, keep it as a witness to my advice, and as often as you pursue it, recognize me speaking in your heart": "hear the lector, not the harpist at your priestly banquet"; "have a better copy made of my letter to your journey with you, to stay with you, and to speak to you in place of my paternal voice."³¹ To the careless post-Marovingians of the 780's, Alcuin must have appeared the fussiest of curmudgeons and a champion pedant.

Something of this note can be heard in the last of the "grammar poems" to be examined. These are lines composed to adorn the walls of the scriptorium:

years following, partly because the original documents from the Council of Nicaea were not translated into a more accurate Latin version until the latter part of the ninth century, leaving a lasting impression that half of Christendom had lapsed into idolatry.

For example, Ermoldus Nigellus' description of the church built by Louis IV at Ingelheim describes a severely functional, chronologically arranged sequence of scenes, detailing Old Testament history on one wall, while "Altera pare retinet Christi vitalis gesta, / Quae terris misus a genitore dedit."³⁹ If the poem is accurate, the pictorial detail is exhaustive, with a different scene suggested by nearly every four lines of the sixty-five.

A similar programme is described by the verses which are said to have been inscribed on the walls of St. Gall. In one part, possibly the entrance, there must have been a full sequence of pictures portraying the Nativity, including in order the angelic appearance of Zachary, the annunciation to Mary, the visitation, the naming of John, the angels and shepherds, the stable at Bethlehem, the coming of the Magi, the dream of Joseph, the flight into Egypt, and the slaughter of the innocents. A similarly detailed continuation of the life of Christ is said to occupy the right wall of what I understand to be the nave of the church, from the baptism of Jesus and the calling of the apostles through a long sequence from the passion, while the sequence is completed with a last judgement scene above and around the cathedra, featuring Gabriel's trumpets and a large shining cross above, and scenes of the blessed and damned below.⁴⁰

These later developments I tentatively connect with the pressures and fears generated by the iconoclastic controversy, because they conform so well to the function of church art approved in the *Libri Carolini*, and because, to my knowledge, these decorative programmes were so different from those which characterized ecclesiastical art before this period. If I am right, this iconographical tendency springs from the same suspicion of the ill-defined and the non-functional which governed Alcuin's attitude towards pedagogy. Just as faulty grammar can lead to heresy, non-functional art can breed idolatry. The guardian against all such excess is, again, the explicit statement, clear and functional. This is true, as Rabanus Maurus was to put it,

Plus quia grammata valet quam vana in imagine forma,
Plusque animae decoris praestat quam falsa colorum
Pictura ostentans rerum non rite figuras.
Nam scriptura pia norma est perfecta salutis. 41

The poem ends with a reminder that painting and the art of pigmentation first derived from Egypt, whose name means "anxious trouble" (*angustiae tribulatio*) as does the art she discovered. By contrast, the Lord chose to carve the rock of the law with writing, which he entrusted to his magister to bring to the people. This fear and suspicion explains the impressive amount of monumental verse written by Alcuin and his successors. The word was always present to guard against idolatry.

The implications of this for poetry are extensive. When the visual icon is stripped of its power to mediate reality, the verbal icon becomes similarly caught, cabined, and put to work at the mill wheel of explicitly functional expression. Alcuin's verbal simplicity, noted by Peter Scott and discussed at the opening of this paper, is more than a simple "censoring out" of the "flowery style." It is apparently part of a rigidly functional approach to learning, art, and the most challenging mysteries of life. The verdict of most critics who read Carolingian Latin poetry is that Theodulf of Orléans is a better poet than Alcuin. I would not challenge that verdict. Though we can learn more from Alcuin about the mood and temper of his time, Theodulf's poetry is always more evocative, complex, ambiguous, and - to continue the comparison - iconic. A supreme irony of Carolingian letters is the iridescent quality of the imagery employed in the *Libri Carolini* to sustain the attack on the iconoclasts. In this, Theodulf - who, as Paul Meyvaert has argued, probably wrote the *Libri*⁴² - illustrates what a complex, contradictory personality he was. As bishop of Orléans, he gave up writing poetry, partially for the reason he gives to his friends, namely, that the responsibilities of his pastoral care did not leave him time for it.⁴³ I think it likely, also, that the plain, unvarnished style of the poetry written by Alcuin, and the even further simplified poetry by Angilbert, did not appeal to him. Certainly, when he returned to poetry in disgrace and exile, it was to the symbolic, fiercely apocalyptic style of his "Epistle to Modoin," describing the portentous drying up of a river and the war of the birds.⁴⁴

As we have seen, the one area of experience which Alcuin could not reduce to the easy formulas of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric was his sense of the evanescence of all things human. Before this mystery

he was capable of standing in wonder and, for that reason, of writing poetry about it. Even in the relatively dry, formal grammar verse I have been examining, the catch in the throat can be heard, the inescapable fear of our universal grave:

Nec bene amque senex poterit vel discere, postquam
Tondenti ingruens candida barba cadit⁴⁵

a couplet which, to me, refers both to old age and death.

Non fugiunt anni mora fluentis aquae... 46
Nec radit ueda fluens, nec radit hora ruens...

Though the "farewell to His Call" is better than Alcuin's other verse, and though it is certainly not representative of his general style of poetry, I still feel he probably did write it. The note of fear and wonder is the same:

Nil sanat aeternum, nihil immutabile vere est,
Obscurat sacrum nos tenebrosa dies.
Decutit et flores subito hiems frigida pulcros,
Perturbat placidum et tristior aura mare.
Qua campis cervos agitat sacra inventus,
Iacubitat fassus nunc baculo senior.
Nos miser, cur te fugitivum, mundas, amamus?
Tu fugis a nobis acceper ubique ruens.
Tu fugiens fugias, Christum nos semper amamus. 48

At the same time, the "sadder breeze" which "ruffles the peaceful sea" seems to me the very opposite of a breeze of despair. This is a sign that the world is wider than the grammatical and rhetorical categories into which Alcuin would fit it, and a sign of his sensitivity to mysteries beyond man's immediate capacity to comprehend. Fittingly, this was also the overtones which provided the urgent motive for his effective work in the reform of teaching and writing, for which he is justly best remembered.

NOTES

- ¹Ithaca, New York, 1959.
- ²*Eruditio und Sapientia: Methylid und Erziehung in der Karolingerzeit; Untersuchungen zu Alcuins Briefen* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1965).
- ³New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1978.
- ⁴MGH *Postea Latini Aevi Carolini*, 1:243-44 (no. 23), 270-72 (no. 58), 274-75 (no. 61), 350-51 (no. 123). See n. 47.
- ⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 169-206 (no. 1); 207-20 (no. 3); 229-35 (no. 9).
- ⁶UTO 33 (1963-64), 233-57.
- ⁷*Ibid.*, p. 233.
- ⁸*Ibid.*, p. 236.
- ⁹Cf. Dag Norberg, *Manuel pratique de latin médiéval* (Paris, 1966), pp. 28-9.
- ¹⁰"Classicism and Christianity: a Poetic Synthesis," *Latomus* 34 (1975): 224-31.
- ¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 229.
- ¹²This idea that the grammarians had a special responsibility to understand and interpret the poets is a commonplace among early medieval grammarians, e.g., Sergius' Commentary on Donatus, "Ars grammatica praeceptis consistit in intellectu posterum et in recte scribendi loquendive ratione," H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* (reg. Hildesheim, 1961), 4: 468; Asper's *Ars Grammatica*, "Grammatica est scientia recte scribendi et enuncianti interpretandi poetas," Keil, 5: 347; Marinus Victorinus' *Ars Grammatica*, "Grammatica quid est? Scientia interpretandi poetas etque historicos et recte scribendi loquendive ratio," Keil, 6: 188. Similarly in Marinius Victorinus, Keil, 6: 4; in Cassiodorus, Keil, 7: 214; in Aulus, Keil, 7: 321; in Donatus, Keil, 7: 376, etc.
- ¹³Cf. Alcuin, *De Grammatica*, PL 101: 853-54.
- ¹⁴*Ibid.*, *De Dialectica*, PL 101: 947-50.
- ¹⁵See, for example, MGH *Epistolae*, 4: 175-78 (no. 121), 166-70 (no. 114), and 243-44 (the latter of Leidrad).

there is nothing fictitious in him." *MCH Epistolae*, 4 338-39 (no. 204)

36. "...is quoque sancti et catholici postea fidei doctores et defensores omnibus hereticis in contentionibus publicis semper superiores exstiterunt." *PL* 101: 854.

37. *Diplomatic Studies in Latin and Greek Documents from the Carolingian Age* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1977), pp. 47-122. The presence of elements from the Mozarabic liturgy in the *Libri* seems to me incontrovertible from the Alcuin's authorship. See Ann Freeman, "Theodulf of Orléans and the *Libri Carolini*," *Speculum* 32 (1957): 665-705, and "Further Studies in the *Libri Carolini* I-II," *Speculum* 40 (1965): 203-289; "III," *Speculum* 46 (1971): 597-612.

38. Hubert Bastgen, ed., *Capitula de Imaginibus: MCH Legum Sacro 3, Concilia 2, Supplementum* (Mannover-Laipzig, 1912-24), p. 3.

39. "The other side holds the life-giving deeds of Christ which, he, sent by his father, brought to the world." *MCH Post. Lat.*, 2: 63-65, lines 179-244, esp. ll. 219-20.

40. *MCH Post. Lat.*, 2: 480-82.

41. *MCH Post. Lat.*, 2: 196-97 (no. 38); esp. lines 4-7: "Because the letter is more powerful than the vain shape of an image, And provides more beauty for the soul than the false Coloured picture, unfittingly displaying the exterior of things. Your faithful Scripture is the perfect norm of salvation."

42. "The Authorship of the 'Libri Carolini': Observations Prompted by a Recent Book," *RS* 89 (1979): 29-57.

43. "Cur Hodo Carmine seu Scribitur," *MCH Post. Lat.*, 1: 542 (no. 44).

44. *Ibid.*, 543-60 (no. 72).

45. "For the old man will not be able to learn very much After his white beard falls in the lap of the shearer." *Ibid.*, 519-20 (no. 93).

46. "For the years flow like flowing water..." "The flowing wave does not return, failing time does not come back..." *Ibid.*, 519-20 (no. 93); 299-300 (no. 80).

47. In a study published after this paper was complete, Peter Godman has provided solid support for the feeling expressed here that this poem is Alcuin's: "Alcuin's Poetic Style and the Authenticity of 'O Mos Calix,'" *RS* 36 ser. 20 (1979): 553-85.

48. "Nothing lasts forever, nothing is really changeless. Night shadows blot the sacred light of day. Joy winter's scythe surprises the loveliest flowers. And a sadder breeze ruffles the peaceful sea. Where once inviolate youth chases deer through the fields, A weary old man leans on his staff. Fleeting world - why do we love you, poor fool? You always run from us, always fail us. Well, run on; we shall give our love to Christ." *Ibid.*, 243-44.

ENGLISH LIBRARIES BEFORE 1066:

USE AND ABUSE OF THE MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

David Dunville

University of Cambridge

For an approach to the subject of the library, its function, and its holdings in Anglo-Saxon England we must rely on assemblages of data which can then be manipulated, classified, and analysed in response to specific needs. Unfortunately, however, these basic collections of materials are, for the most part, not available. Research has, as always, proceeded in a disorderly fashion. We have Neil Ker's invaluable *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (MLGB) and *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (now with its supplement),¹ Alan Bishop's *English Caroline Minuscule* (ECM) and the fundamental series of papers which preceded it,² the first two volumes (by Jonathan Alexander and Elizabeth Temple, respectively) of Alexander's *Survey of Illuminated Manuscripts in the British Isles*,³ and - in a quite different class - Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English 597-1066* (which is, of course, more concerned with texts than with manuscripts).⁴ We possess, in addition, a series of more detailed and pointed studies.

I have, of course, ignored thus far one monumental work. But I offer this brief listing in order to make the point that the major reference works which have appeared are works of analysis or, at least, of classification. In other words, splendid as these books are when taken on their own terms, they, in fact, invite us to run before we can walk. They give us classified or analytic lists when we do not have assembled the raw materials from which they have been created. Each of these works has been a boon to every scholar in the field on innumerable occasions; without them we should undoubtedly have made many (perhaps I should say, many more) foolish mistakes. In the case of MLGB and ECM, the works invite a host of further questions of the most basic nature. The *Catalogue*, on the other hand, gives a comprehensive

Insular Latin Studies, ed. Michael Herren.
Papers in Medieval Studies 1 (Toronto:
Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981)
pp. 153-178

if that is the right word for a volume of such a size - of a whole literature, and no doubt a much more accurate and representative one (giving full weight in particular to the extensive and popular prose literature) than many a recent history of Old English literature. Yet one may legitimately doubt, I think, the wisdom and value of focussing attention on a vernacular literature in a way which divorces it from its essential Latin literary context; for if we study English literature in the vernacular without thoroughly integrating it with its native and external Latin context, we make a travesty of English culture. As with the literature, so a fortiori of the libraries which housed that literature and of the scriptoria which disseminated it. This is not the least of the reasons for welcoming the study, announced by Professor Colin Chase of the University of Toronto, of the Latin materials to be found in manuscripts containing Old English.

Desiderata in this field of study are, therefore, many and fundamental. I wish to discuss here some of the more general problems with which the subject is concerned, problems which may seem, at first glance, to be made more difficult of solution by the state of publication discussed above. I propose to consider also some of the problems, of both method and interpretation, which are suggested by recent research and publication and by recent scholarly trends.

Surveys of the Manuscript Materials

What, then, are the desiderata of our field of enquiry? It seems to me that everything depends on the collection and publication of the raw manuscript evidence. Until such material is readily available, our efforts, in whichever direction, must of necessity be amateurish. When all the evidence is eventually assembled, we shall be in possession of only a fraction (an incalculable fraction, given so many variables) of what once existed; to accept an even smaller fraction, dictated merely by our own inertia, is a recipe for grievous error.

Do we then have a model to follow? The work I have so far avoided mentioning is, of course, E. A. Lowe's monumental *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (CLA) (and I should put alongside it, as an essential complement, the *Compendium Chartarum*).⁵ Here, of course, is the comprehensive collection of manuscript materials for a whole era of book production.

From it could be launched, I think it is fair to say, a major work of reinterpretation like Julian Brown's examination of insular script in his magnificent series of Lyell Lectures, "The Insular System of Scripts, ca. 600-ca. 850," whose hoped for appearance in print will give us many new and valuable insights.

For my purpose of looking at the library holdings of Anglo-Saxon England, one has only to undertake the straightforward task of making an abstract from CLA of the directly relevant matter before beginning more detailed work; and that from which one is making the abstract is itself an assemblage of the total content, both codicological and literary. In CLA, as complemented by the essential *Chartae*, one lacks only one thing: thorough indexing, telling one - above all - the texts which the manuscripts contain. Even here, however, our wants are being supplied by the extraordinarily thorough indices undertaken by Professor James John, of Cornell University; one hopes that such an invaluable resource will soon be available.

For the period up to A.D. 800, then, we are extraordinarily well served. We have only to extract the material and ask the right questions. If we remain ignorant, it is because we have asked the wrong questions or because we do not have sufficient surviving information to enable us to give an answer.

For the years from 800 to 1066 we are in a wholly different position. We have to go back almost to a pre-Lowe type of situation. Yet the surviving manuscript materials for the cultural history of these two and half centuries in England are enormously greater in quantity than for the preceding period. Where, then, do we begin? What I should like to suggest at the outset is that an English equivalent of CLA for this period should not be our model, but at best our long-term aim. If the approach we adopt towards this material is too gradual, too comprehensive, and in every way too demanding, much time will be spent waiting for someone to finish a task he almost certainly will not complete. The very success of Lowe, starting such a major project after a lifetime's experience with manuscripts, having a succession of the most formidably able and learned collaborators, and completing it (against all odds) just before he died at a ripe old age forty years later, should in fact be a warning to us of the scale of such a comprehensive project and of the near impossibility of achieving it.

Various more limited projects have, in fact, been put in motion over the years. In 1962, in his inaugural lecture, Professor Julian

Brown announced a project to list all manuscripts of pre-Conquest English provenance, and ultimately to catalogue them.⁷ In 1978, I received generous funding from the University of Pennsylvania to enable me to complete an annotated handlist of these manuscripts, which could then be circulated as a working guide to the manuscript sources for the period. Happily, these efforts, and many others tending in the same direction or on a more limited scale by other scholars, have now effectively been superseded by or incorporated in the project which Professor Haim Genesee has announced. The first result is the appearance, in *Anglo-Saxon England*, of "A Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100."⁸ The eventual intention is the publication of "a bibliographical handlist of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts": such a reference work, carried through under the auspices of a remarkable university department, would be an aid of immense value to Anglo-Saxonists.

The Types of Evidence Provided by Manuscripts

We can hope, therefore, to have the bulk of the raw materials available for use before too long. Our approach to the libraries, and to the manuscript production, of Anglo-Saxon England will be revolutionised. In the meantime, I can write only with the information and experience accumulated in a one-man effort, but aided at the final stage of preparation by a preview (which Professor Genesee generously allowed me) of the "Preliminary List."

We need to think carefully about what kind of evidence we can expect and hope to obtain from such a collection of basic sources. We shall still not be able to rush at a cultural history of later Anglo-Saxon England, for the mass of information to be retrieved from this corpus will be enormous, and the interpenetrating issues are potentially so complex.

I think that the material offered divides itself, for my purposes here, into three principal groups, though no doubt opinions will differ on this: (1) the evidence provided by the physical existence of the manuscripts; (2) the evidence offered by the texts purveyed by these manuscripts; and (3) the evidence for lost (or unidentified) manuscripts and their contents.

The "physical" evidence given us, above all, a sense of the mass of manuscript output, though in a purely relative way since we possess no formula which will enable us to relate the quantity of surviving

manuscripts to the quantity originally produced. We can gain a sense of how output and standards compare with other periods or places; but even the route to this modest type of comparison is fraught with difficulties arising from our many areas of ignorance. Observation also of the layout and make-up of manuscripts and of the juxtaposition of texts can tell us something about attitudes to types of texts, to competing or complementary languages, and so on.

We are offered also, of course, evidence for the existence of a certain body of texts in English libraries in the period in question. Naturally, we cannot guarantee from their presence, especially in foreign immigrant manuscripts, that because a copy of a text existed it was read. But we are at least made aware of the possibility of physical evidence able to support an argument which may have been made on textual grounds; or we may be offered a new range of possible literary influences, hitherto unsuspected or improved, on English authors of the period. This is not, of course, to assert that because a manuscript of a given work existed at Worcester it could have been used by a Canterbury author, for example: one must be on one's guard against that kind of supporting argument.

We learn, too, not merely which authors and texts were available and might have been read, but what kind of literature was being produced and copied at that time. The work of Michael Lapidge over the past decade has indicated what riches there are for those who wish to work on Anglo-Latin and who can cope with the rigours of the hermeneutic style.⁹

The recognition and examination of consistent patterns of gloss or comment in a manuscript or, better, a group of manuscripts can introduce us in a revealing way to the cultural milieu of a literary or quasi-literary personality. The obvious example from recent scholarship is the group of manuscripts associated - whether rightly or not - with Archbishop Wulfstan. That was the growth-industry of the last generation.¹⁰ That of the present generation of scholarship seemed to me to be about St. Dunstan,¹¹ a figure who - like Wulfstan - has suddenly seized the stage.¹² No doubt other figures - some of whom will hopefully be anonymous and perhaps, therefore, able to be viewed more dispassionately - will emerge from the new corpus of materials.

The literary borrowings by datable or localizable Anglo-Latin authors will also be of considerable interest when considered in the light of the manuscript evidence. Various points may emerge. With the aid of an indexed handlist, it may very well be possible, by collation, to identify the precise copy of a source used by an author. This would lead to various possible conclusions. Such an identification would help give a provenance to the manuscript and perhaps, through consequent links with other scribes or manuscripts, would give it a point of origin. Annotations in the manuscript might then be able to be associated with the English author in question, and more could be learned about him as a literary personality.

Alternatively, study of the English manuscript tradition of a work might indicate a lack of evidence for the circulation of a given branch of the tradition in England. An authorial borrowing from that branch might then be questioned, and a context for an alternative indirect borrowing sought.

There are various ways, with the aid of the handlist under discussion, in which the former existence of now lost manuscripts can be demonstrated. The greatest difficulty will arise in the situation where such a manuscript (whose existence in, say, the tenth century can be demonstrated) was a continental book. That continental manuscript may still survive but bear no physical indication that it has ever been in England; if it remains in an English library it cannot escape forever, but if it returned to the continent its English history might escape detection almost indefinitely.

However, such caveats aside (for it is no use postponing a handlist on such considerations), lost manuscripts can be documented. A non-authorial copy of a text must have an exemplar; if the manuscript is English, and the exemplar cannot be identified as extant in the text history, then we have clear evidence for another copy of that text in England (whether it was itself English or foreign is another matter) at the period of copying. The English tradition of a work may presuppose any number of lost copies of the work, to complete the stems; and stemmatics can only ever give a minimum number of lost copies. Borrowings by Anglo-Latin authors may indicate an exemplar of secular or continental origin which cannot be identified. Text historical or palaeographical criteria, or both together, may establish dependence of a copy on two different (and perhaps incomplete) exemplars. It may be possible to show, once glossing traditions are

better understood,¹³ that text and gloss (or different layers of gloss) depend on different exemplars. Collations may be identified, pointing to that constant medieval inferiority complex about the state of one's own copy of a text and incidentally indicating the former existence of another copy. A lost copy of a work can never be posited without a great deal of hard work, but over a period we should be able to build up a rather less skeletal picture of English library resources in the Anglo-Saxon period, and particularly in its latter half.

We might refer to one final source of indications of now lost manuscripts, and these at particular centres, namely, deliberate statements about library holdings. The best known are, of course, Alcuin's account of the library at York¹⁴ and the twelfth-century copy of the list of Bishop Aethelwold's donation of books to Peterborough.¹⁵ All the surviving library catalogues (which also belong to this type of statement) are of post-Conquest date, but it is sometimes possible to extract some pre-Conquest information from them.¹⁶

The Actual Manuscripts: Analysis of the Materials

It is still very difficult to say with any certainty how many manuscripts survive which were in English libraries before 1066. Two major difficulties are the scatter of English manuscripts in continental libraries (and, for the early period, doubts as to whether or not they were rather products of anglophone - or Celtic - institutions) and the problem of identifying continental manuscripts once in England but since returned, under whatever circumstances, to the continent. A case in point is the tangled history of a manuscript like the currently fashionable *Vaticanae Latinae* 3363, a sixth-century French *Beothine*, annotated in a Welsh hand of ca. 900 (Aneur has been both suggested and doubted) and in the hand currently identified as Dunstan's; it now lies in a continental repository.¹⁷ Less exotic, perhaps, is a history like that of the Utrecht *Psalter* which spanned a pre-Conquest Continental journey and remained in England, but returned to the continent in modern times.¹⁸ More are famous manuscripts; but many more humble ones undoubtedly lie unnoticed on the continent. They are likely to be found, in any number, by someone looking for tail-tail traces.¹⁹ However few, of an English history, Anglo-Caroline manuscripts themselves, however, are similarly scattered: the extraordinary Vergil in the Vatican's *Reginensis* collection (discovered some fifteen years ago by English scholars, and assigned

by Mr. Bishop to Worcester)²⁰ and a liturgical manuscript found in Poland by Dr. Temple.²¹ are merely two examples of what will continue to disturb any comfortable but hasty assumptions that we have identified all the important surviving manuscripts.

Something of the order of four hundred insular manuscripts of the seventh and eighth centuries have been extracted from CIA; of these about one hundred should be deleted as doubtfully relevant to England. For the ninth century, on the other hand, we have, as far as I know, no count, though the number of surviving books is assuredly very small indeed.²² Again, as far as I know, no public attempt has been made to count the Latin books in that characteristically tenth-century English script, the Anglo-Saxon square minuscule; in fact, there would seem to be about eighty. Of the Anglo-Caroline which spans the last century, or century and a quarter, of the English state - from the mid-tenth-century copy of *Samragdom* on the Rule of St. Benedict (Cambridge, University Library, MS. 2.14) to the "Cambridge Songs" manuscript (Og. 5.35) or the Worcester Passional (Corpus Christi College MS 9), if I may stay with Cambridge manuscripts! - there survive, according to Mr. Bishop's count, some six hundred books and fragments,²³ though I must confess that I have not yet identified anything like that number. And of course we know from Dr. Ker's Catalogue of some four hundred vernacular items, of which perhaps 150 were written wholly or principally in Old English; of these, approximately five-sixths belong to the tenth and eleventh centuries.²⁴

Some divisions, on grounds of script, between manuscripts (or annotating hands) originating in different areas can also be made, both for the pre-Viking period and for the tenth century, between major political units or geographical regions or spheres of ecclesiastical influence. In any event, we have a substantial amount of material, and various preliminary ways - primarily palaeographical - of classifying it. This brings me to the question of the evidence on which manuscripts have been assigned to specific centres.

The Attribution of Manuscripts to Centres

There are innumerable items of evidence which allow us to assign manuscripts a location, whether a single provenance or even a point of origin. In this matter, I propose to focus here on two questions: first, on what the sum total of that evidence appears to tell us; and secondly, on the disturbing implications of new work, on Anglo-Saxon

royal diplomas of the period 924-1016, for the attribution of manuscripts of that period to a given centre on the evidence of script or scribe.

The second edition of Neil Ker's *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, published in 1964, is the reference base for an attempt to obtain an overview of library holdings in this period. But it is not, of course, one of the aims of that book to answer straightforward questions about library holdings before 1066, and we must proceed with caution. By my count, Ker notices 341 manuscripts of pre-Conquest date as having been in the possession of an identifiable institution at any time before 1540. It is in the nature of his book that it cannot tell us in detail when the manuscript was at a given place or what the evidence is that it was indeed there. A code simply indicates the class of evidence used. In general, where an attribution depends on script alone, that is regarded as an insufficient basis for inclusion.²⁵ Contents and external features are, therefore, the key classes of evidence. Criteria of inclusion and exclusion are deliberately not applied with rigorous consistency, however.²⁶

Among those 342 notices there are some duplications of entry; some manuscripts, which have travelled, naturally show evidence for their presence at more than one centre. Ker's listing does not tell us which manuscripts are English and which are not, or, for that matter, when the foreign books came to England, if indeed that is known.

There are many difficulties for us, then, in using these data. How are we to refine the information to our purpose? The first point to be borne in mind is that, given the criteria for inclusion, this number of 342 is a maximum. I have rarely, if ever, seen notice by those citing Ker's book of his indications of doubt. In fact, the notices of some seventy-two of these manuscripts carry a question-mark to warn the user that the evidence for their location is not wholly satisfactory. Of the remaining 170 volumes, some seventeen are assigned to institutions which did not exist before the Norman Conquest.²⁷ Abandoning these rather precise figures, we may say that there are many manuscripts - and perhaps especially those of foreign origin - which are unlikely to have been, before 1066, at the place of their later known provenance. This is perhaps the most difficult area: it is where the paleographer's working rule (most frequently enunciated by Mr. Bishop)²⁸ - that, barring specific indications to the contrary, a manuscript may be presumed to have originated at the

place of its medieval provenance - is most likely to be a false guide taken, for instance, the case of Bury Saint Edmunds (Suffolk), where a reform monastery was established in the early eleventh century.²⁹ Twenty-one pre-Conquest volumes are assigned by Ker to Bury, all but one on excellent - indeed, unimpeachable - evidence.³⁰ Yet, of these, one third can be recognised as continental books of the ninth century.³¹ I can find no evidence that some were in England before 1066;³² others indicate that they were in England already in the mid-tenth century,³³ well before the foundation of reform Bury.

In other words, Ker's listing can, for our purpose, be only the very beginning of an enquiry. I shall have more to say later about other difficulties in store for us as users of this material. However, I want now to try to assess the usefulness to us of work done since 1964, in particular the research embodied in T. A. M. Bishop's *English Caroline Minuscule* (1971) and in his series of preliminary papers, published principally in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*.³⁴ It is a tragedy that when this enormous work, of well over a decade's intensive researches, came to be summarised, it had to be within the exceedingly brief compass of an *Oxford Palaeographical Handbook*. We have been deprived thereby of an enormous amount of information, insight, and considered judgement. Mr. Bishop has since taken up another major subject and we are unlikely to see further fruits of his Anglo-Caroline labours. Starting from the evidence of ownership, of the sort that I referred to earlier; following the working rule about the stability of the average manuscript book; and then concentrating, above all, on identifying individual scribes and their work and the relations of these with one another, Bishop has assigned between three hundred and four hundred specimens an origin at one of a small number of key centres - hardly more than thirteen in number.³⁵ And he makes the point that "no more than seven scriptoria (St. Augustine's, Canterbury; Christ Church, Canterbury; Abingdon; Winchester, Old Minster; Winchester, New Minster; Worcester; and Exeter) supplied about half the items (about three hundred, therefore) recognized as exemplars of English Carolines."³⁶

It is plain that the tenth and eleventh centuries constituted a period of considerable manuscript production in England, and principally in the south. If Mr. Bishop's assignments of manuscripts to given centres are accurate, and if some means could be found by which all his detailed judgements could be made available to the interested

public, we should have at our disposal an incomparable resource for the history of the period.

However, there is one recent major development which casts some considerable doubt, in principle at least, on the potential accuracy of these attributions of origin to groups of Anglo-Caroline manuscripts. Bishop's principal method was to proceed by linking in chains manuscripts sharing collaborating scribes. Occasionally, a generic likeness would be invoked to make a connection between an attributed and an unattributed group.³⁷ A procedure which has its dangers but where the opinion of an acknowledged expert must be trusted with considerable respect. Another caveat which would be entered by someone like myself - a historian interested in manuscripts rather than a professional palaeographer - would be that these long chains, depending on the identification of the work of individual scribes, contain what appears to be a worryingly high degree of subjectivity of judgement. A more tangible and substantial difficulty has been presented by new work on the Latin diplomas of English kings from Aethelstan to Aethelred, 924 to 1016.

It has been the generally received doctrine (if the details have nonetheless been the subject of uncertainty and dispute) that the substantial series of Latin royal diplomas issued at this period was produced by ecclesiastical institutions acting as, or on behalf of, the recipient of the benefit conveyed by the charter.³⁸ However, Dr. Simon Keynes has now systematically demolished this view, demonstrating the existence in this period of what must certainly be called a royal chancery staff.³⁹ Recognition of the centralized production of royal charters, based on a professional group of royal scribes, brings in its train a series of acute problems for our study of book-production in these years.

Under the old view of their production, original single-sheet diplomas - once recognized as such - offered specimens of script which were not merely precisely dated but localized too. A royal charter to Abingdon could automatically be assigned to the Abingdon scriptorium, for example.⁴⁰ (It was partly for this reason that the new British Academy series was designed to be published by archive, rather than by reign or other period. It now seems plain that when the current edition has been completed, we shall have to have another, and much more heavily edited, series arranged chronologically to complement it.) Charter-evidence would, on this view of charter-production, be used

as key evidence for the location of scribes or script-varieties. The same scribe, identified in a diploma and in a book, would locate that book beyond reasonable doubt. This argument must now be stood on its head, or worse. At best, the identification would show either that the book in question was itself the product of a royal writing-office (and, at the present state of our knowledge, that would probably be a rather rash conclusion) or that the scribe of the charter was also, at some point in his career, a member of the scriptorium in which the book had been produced. In other words, we must now use the evidence of books to help us identify the scriptoria whose members also saw service in the royal writing-office, rather than relying on charters to locate manuscript-books.⁴¹ Plainly we have lost a good deal of apparent evidence, and our task of localising tenth and eleventh-century manuscripts has become noticeably more difficult.

It is difficult, as yet, to assess the full impact of this development on Bishop's attributions. Examination of his detailed papers does indicate reliance on such charter-evidence at key points in various arguments. There is, of course, no question at all of his conclusions being uniformly vitiated. His research always begins within the solid external and contextual evidence of provenance and origin. However, all that work will have to be reconsidered in detail. Here, surely, is a classic case of developments in a related field overturning assumptions and constructs in ours.

The principal casualty will be apparent identifications of the scribe and scripts of the less important centres, from which books are not yet directly identifiable: a good example is Saint Albans, for which an Aethelredian charter of the year 1007 was taken by Bishop as a representative script specimen.⁴² There are still wider implications: the type of Anglo-Caroline script believed to be characteristic of houses of the Aethelwold connection was supposed, on the evidence of its royal diplomas of the early reform period, to be particularly associated with, and perhaps even created at, Abingdon.⁴³ In fact, the removal of this charter-evidence creates great doubts about the productivity of the Abingdon scriptorium before ca. 1000 and destroys the argument for early association of Anglo-Caroline Type I with Abingdon.⁴⁴

The Library and the Use of Books

I wish to turn now to a very rapid consideration of just what we

mean when we speak of a "library" at this period. We can attack this rather important question both from the manuscripts themselves and from external evidence. Many scholars have written on the general problems surrounding the early medieval library, but probably the most convenient general introduction for students of English culture is Francis Wormald's paper on "The Monastic Library."⁴⁵

In this period we are of course talking primarily, though not exclusively, about the monastic library. But, before following up the more complex implications of that point, I should like to mention some of the specific functions of books in the monastic context. A high proportion of our surviving manuscript volumes comprise gospel books, miscellaneous books of the bible, legends and passionals, and more strictly liturgical books. We cannot guarantee that any of these would serve as what we would recognise nowadays as a library-book. Some of the biblical matter and all of the liturgical would belong in church.⁴⁶ The legendary and the passionals would probably find principal employment in the refectory, in the provision of pious reading during meals.⁴⁷ In short, the bulk of the largest group of our surviving manuscripts can hardly be referred to a library context. In later English library catalogues such volumes are often not listed, but turn up in inventories of movable property, including relics, the church plate, and other church furnishings. Wormald, in fact, conjectured that some saints' lives and some liturgies were kept with the local saints' relics, or at any rate in close proximity to the shrine of a local saint.⁴⁸

One of our major problems, especially in the earlier period, is to understand the general attitude to books and reading prevalent in any given monastery or federation of monasteries. A plethora of relics, particularly in Ireland, associated conflicting positions concerning almost every facet of monastic life.⁴⁹ We know - or think we know - what St. Benedict had to say on the subject. But a major desideratum is the study of all the other surviving rules to determine their attitudes. In Benedictine monasteries - and for England this is not a serious trend until the twelfth-century reform⁵⁰ - there are certain normal features. There were corporate book collections, an institutional library. The monks spent a certain amount of time reading the bible, and on a regular basis. St. Benedict's prescriptions are found in section 48 of his *Regula*, and those for reading aloud in the refectory are in section 38. As far as we can tell, on very poor evidence, the

books were kept in cupboards or closets (*almarium* or *almariorum* is the usual word).⁵¹

There are many accounts of the ceremony at which, on the first Monday in Lent, there was a solemn distribution of books in the chapter-house.⁵² This would serve as reading for a specified period, sometimes for an entire year. Dom Anscar Mundó, in a now classic article,⁵³ showed how, by a fundamental misunderstanding of the word *bibliotheca* from the Carolingian period onwards, library-reading rather than strictly bible-reading came to be specified. As a result, suitable matter needed to be chosen especially for Lent. One charming list of acceptable reading was referred to by Mundó: specified for Lent was that the most bizarre text of insular associations, the *Cosmographie of Aethicus Ister*.⁵⁴

The institutional library therefore needed a point of supply for its reading-matter. But it would probably be a mistake to assume that the house scriptorium necessarily provided most of these needs. There was likely to have been an unending, if very occasional, supply of books from outside, obtained by gift, by purchase at home or abroad, or by exchange. It would be interesting to study the proportion of liturgical to non-liturgical books among those manuscripts whose writing could be ascribed to the scriptorium of the house which (later) owned them; we might find that the smaller scriptoria in particular devoted all or most of their efforts to liturgical books, and obtained other types of book by various different means.

In the reform-period, the example of Laofric, though famous, must nonetheless have been fairly typical. Bishop Laofric of Crediton decided to move his diocesan seat to St. Peter's Monastery, Exeter, in 1030. But he found it necessary to endow his canon with a library, for when he got to Exeter he found no general library, but one capitulary, one epistle-book, one old private breviary, and one old lectionary in a poor condition. Many monastic houses were founded or re-founded in the reform period, and would have needed books. It is interesting to ask, for I shall do no more, how the founders - whether lay or ecclesiastical - got hold of books for this purpose - whether impressive library - the list of the donation survives - includes manuscripts written at the two Canterbury houses and some interesting foreign volumes.⁵⁵

The current appearance of manuscripts may give some indication of how books were used, but we should beware of too facile generalizations.

Closing does not necessarily mean that the particular copy of a book was read, much less used in class - the whole concept of the "classbook" seems to be in severe need of a re-evaluation.⁵⁶ Judging by consistent (if undatable) marking one does find in pre-Conquest books, they were indeed used as research resources,⁵⁷ whether by authors or by someone doing a little research, perhaps for the purposes of legal (or even theological) controversy.

We need to look also at the institutional evidence for libraries. We find a few books which seem to be candidates for recognition as volumes tied to an office, handed down from one incumbent to the next: one might mention the Parker Chronicle and, in Ireland, the Book of Armagh.⁵⁸ But libraries seem to be found in at least one other context, the royal. Whether Anglo-Saxon kings ever had court-libraries or palace-schools is uncertain: a case could perhaps be made for Alfred of Wessex. A case has been made, if not conclusively, for the importance of the New Minster, Winchester, as a point of dissemination of manuscripts in the tenth and eleventh centuries,⁵⁹ and one is bound to wonder if this alleged process owes anything to royal patronage. We know that Alfred, through necessity, farmed out his works far and wide to scriptoria;⁶⁰ Athelstan commissioned a book from Glastonbury to give to Chester-le-Street in the 930's.⁶¹ But Athelstan was also the owner of a whole series of foreign volumes, often of luxurious quality, impressively studied by Armitage Robinson,⁶² which he mostly donated to religious houses. We see relatively few monarchs taking a direct interest in books. In the earlier period Aldfrith of Northumbria, and a generation or so later Caedwulf - who vetted or (to put it more unkindly) censored Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* - are those who are known to have had literary interests.⁶³ Whether kings ever commissioned copies of books for themselves we do not know; if they did so in the tenth or the eleventh century we equally do not know whether or not the royal writing-office could have coped. In short, we know nothing of any possible relationship of chancery, court-library, and palace-school.

Learning and External Contacts

Naturally, one of the key results we can obtain from a study of the manuscripts of the period seen as a whole is a sense of the shifting patterns of cultural development (or stagnation or decline), the effects of external influences, and so on. I am not going to try

to survey all these developments here, but I should like to draw attention to areas where - it seems to me - particularly promising developments can be expected to take place. A census of manuscripts will obviously produce its most valuable results in the period after 800, for which we have so far had no compendious work. There are perhaps four areas where I think we may hope for some enlightenment.

The ninth is, of course, the dark century when visible manifestations of the literary culture of the Anglo-Saxon golden age vanish, to be replaced by the evidence of barbarity of the sort which Michael Lapidge has described in his contribution. I should not wish to stress that collapse to the same extreme degree that Nicholas Brooks⁶⁴ and he have done nor, I think, should I wish to take King Alfred's words⁶⁵ absolutely at face value. I remind myself that from the last third of the ninth century for example, we have a perfectly respectable, if provincial, piece of work in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 83, a collection of computistical matter;⁶⁶ this comes from the very period when Northumbria, its area of origin, is supposed to have lain most heavily under the Danish yoke. In short, I hope that a census of manuscripts will produce material which will give us a more rounded view of ninth-century Anglo-Latin culture than we have at present, and which will, perhaps, somewhat dispel the gloom in the background to my next area of desired enlightenment.

We need to know a great deal more about the development of script, of scriptoria, and of Latin learning in the last decade of the ninth century and in the first quarter of the tenth century. There has been recent, important work on the subject by Dr. Robert Dohmen of the University of Toronto,⁶⁷ and there are general signs of a quickening of interest among scholars.⁶⁸ However, work in this field has proceeded from non-paleographical assumptions, and again I should like to stress the dangers, as with the charters, of relying for the first principles on work or assumptions from other fields of study, which, when challenged, may wreak havoc on one's own. It is a commonplace among scholars studying the period that there are five manuscripts, deriving from a single scriptorium (which has been argued to be the Old Minster at Winchester) in the last decade of the ninth century and the very beginnings of the tenth. They are the first section of the Parker Chronicle (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 173), at least in part; the Tollerbach Old English Genesis (London, British Library, MS Add. 47967); BL MS Cotton Ocho 2.xi (and its *disjecta membra*); BL MS

Royal 12.D.17 (Bald's Leechbook); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 27 (the Junius Psalter). This is stated bluntly, for example in *MGH*,⁶⁹ and has been elaborated by many writers. It is on this group of manuscripts that, as Alistair Campbell put it, our knowledge of early West Saxon is grounded.⁷⁰ And here is the English evidence for the beginnings of that Square type of Anglo-Saxon minuscule which is so characteristic a script of the tenth century. It is imperative that the revival of English scriptorial standards during, or, as I should now prefer, in the wake of the Alfredian revival. I have searched high and low for independent evidence which would confirm the dating assigned to these examples of incipient and early Square minuscule. But the dating seems to depend entirely on arguments arising from perceptions of the early history of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. In the course of work towards a project for a new collaborative edition of the Chronicle and its related records, I have been re-examining its textual history. The first scribe's portion of the A-text (CCCC 173) stops in the middle of the annal for 891; from this it has generally been concluded that the manuscript was first written at that date.⁷² Yet, for want of comparable but independently dated specimens of script, I did not think that judgment could be even approximately confirmed on paleographical evidence. For a series of reasons which seem to me compelling, I do not think the dating can be right; I should conclude instead that a case can be made for a view that the text up to the annal for 920, ending on fol. 23v, was written by scribe 1, and the text from the annal for 920 to the end of the manuscript by scribe 2.⁷³ Such a redating would necessarily affect the chronology of the development of the script. In short, the unfortunate circumstance recurs that reconsideration of a textual question causes great difficulties for settled paleographical doctrine. Our subject is still at the stage of development where too much certainty can arise from an insufficient assemblage of evidence.

A census of manuscripts owned in Anglo-Saxon England will necessarily throw into relief immigrants from the Celtic-speaking countries of the British Isles and from the continent. Approximately one hundred such manuscripts are at present known from the whole period.⁷⁴ Among these, one notable group has recently been the subject of investigation, books of Breton origin.⁷⁵ Brittany, as a continental country of Celtic speech and institutions, but politically and in its ecclesiastical culture heavily influenced by the Frankish

empire on its eastern border, almost falls between the two general areas I have distinguished. During the century beginning with the arrival of Aethel at King Alfred's court, the Celtic-speaking countries provided a great source of intellectual stimulus for the reviving ecclesiastical learning of Anglo-Saxon England.⁷⁶ Brittany was an early and major influence on the ecclesiastical revival in southern England at the beginning of the tenth century, a development which would have been perceived very distally but for the cumulative effect of manuscript evidence. The Welsh and Cornish contribution could hardly have been appreciated without such evidence. Detailed work on tenth-century manuscripts of English origin is also revealing much evidence for the use of exemplars of Celtic origin, and has even suggested the presence of Celtic scribes in Anglo-Saxon scriptoria.⁷⁷ Further work will assuredly produce more insights of this sort. But it was not only the Celtic speaking countries which contributed to the revivification of English religion and learning in the tenth century. As work proceeds on the history of tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature, more points of contact are found with continental centres, scholars, and literary fashions.⁷⁸ The manuscript evidence, while extremely varied, is nonetheless fairly consistently pointing to Rheims,⁷⁹ northeast France,⁸⁰ the Liège region,⁸¹ and Flanders⁸² as principal sources of imported manuscripts. What further work must seek to promote is a greater comprehension of the particular contexts in which the known imported books arrived in England; very useful results can be expected in this area, which may lead to further modification of traditional views on the sources of the tenth-century reform culture.

Finally, there are, I believe, grounds for the supposition that our view may change of the Anglo-Saxon eleventh century in respect of book production and ecclesiastical learning. It has long been believed that the steam went out of the reforming monastic movement by the early eleventh century, leading to an increased secularism and a decline in learning in the late Anglo-Saxon church. Professor Frank Barlow provided an effective, if only partial, defence of the English church from ca. 1000 to 1066,⁸³ but powerful confirmation of the old established view was suggested upon the publication of RCV. Mr. Bishop wrote that the "intellectual movement which the Caroline accompanied seems to have been poorly sustained" and noted that in the eleventh century "the script seems to be in decline," a decline paralleled "in intellectual interests and commerce";⁸⁴ his harshest comments are

are reserved for the period from the middle years of the century when he sees "intellectual curiosity and Anglo-Latin letters alive but hardly flourishing."⁸⁵ It might be supposed from all this that English book-production went into a sharp decline during the first quarter of the eleventh century, a trend which was not reversed until the massive Anglo-Norman multiplication of texts at the end of the century. The statistics which may now be collected from Gneuss's list suggest nothing of the sort, however. From the middle years of the tenth century to the beginning of the eleventh, we have some two hundred surviving books and fragments. In the roughly comparable period from then until the Norman Conquest we have approximately the same number, perhaps a few more. These two corpora will have to be studied in much more detail before one can elaborate on the proposition that book-production did not suffer a serious decline in the Anglo-Saxon eleventh century. When manuscripts can be more closely dated (say, to quarter-centuries) we must discover what changes occur over shortish periods. We must ask which centres were active at which particular times. We shall need to know about evidence for continuing use of the tenth-century books. The contents of new books will have to be scrutinized for changes in taste. The relationship between Latin and the vernacular in the book-production of a period when a formal separation of Latin and vernacular scripts took place will bear much study, though it already seems clear that in the eleventh century a greater proportion of English books was written in the vernacular than was the case in the tenth (unless tenth-century vernacular manuscripts were subject to more severe vicissitudes than their Latin counterparts). In brief, we may say that the eleventh century must necessarily come into its own as an area of study, in the way that the tenth century has held our attention during the past decade. The cultural history of Anglo-Saxon England still offers many avenues of enquiry and many revelations for its students. To the extent that the period after A. D. 800 has been less comprehensively studied, the greatest gains may be expected there. The publication in 1980 of Helmut Gneuss's "Preliminary List" should inaugurate a decade of substantial advances from a secure base of primary materials. The student now has the raw materials at hand; he has only to start to manipulate them. Studies of manuscripts and of the circulation of texts should flourish, in much the same way that the study of Anglo-Latin letters has burgeoned in the 1970's. With the resources now available we may hope to see more use and less abuse of manuscript-evidence in writing early English cultural history.

NOTES

¹ *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, (2nd ed. London, 1964), first published in 1941; *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), and supplement in *ASE* 5 (1976).

² T. A. M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971), for his other essays, see notes 34 and 71 below.

³ J. J. C. Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts, 6th to the 9th Century* (London, 1978); E. Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts 900-1066* (London, 1976).

⁴ J. D. A. Ogilvy, *Books Known to the English 597-1066* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), first published as *Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670-804)* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

⁵ E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century* (12 vols., Oxford, 1934-71; with revised edition of vol. 2, Oxford, 1972); A. Bruckner & R. Merical, *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* (Olten, 1954-), in progress.

⁶ Cf. Lowe, *CLA Supplement*, p. 84, and J. J. John's account of Lowe's work, *American Council of Learned Societies Newsletter* 20/5 (October, 1969).

⁷ T. J. Brown, "Latin Palaeography since Traube," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 3 (1959-63): 361-81 (at p. 372).

⁸ *ASE* 9 (1980): 1-60.

⁹ See his survey, "The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature," *ASE* 4 (1975): 67-111; on tenth-century poetry see also his "Three Latin Poems from Aethelwold's School at Winchester," *ASE* 1 (1972): 83-137, and "Some Latin Poems as Evidence for the Reign of Aethelstan," *ASE* 9 (1980): 61ff.

¹⁰ The work of Karl Jost, Dorothy Bethurum, and Dorothy Whitelock, who brought Wulfstan to full scholarly attention, is summarized and discussed in *Continuations and Beginnings*, ed. E. G. Stanley (London, 1966). For a close study of one of the manuscripts see R. R. Loe, *A Wulfstan Manuscript Containing Institutes, Laws and Homilies*, *British Museum Cotton Vero A.1* (Copenhagen, 1971), a facsimile reproduction. The palaeographical arguments are developed by R. A. Kar, "The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan," in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. F. Clarendon and R. Hughes (Cambridge, 1971). That their work has created

something of a scholarly fiction is suggested by C. E. Nohler, "Some Service-Books of the Later Saxon Church," in *Tenth-Century Studies*, ed. David Parsons (Chichester, 1975).

¹¹ See R. W. Hunt, *St. Dunstan's Classbook from Glastonbury* (Amsterdam, 1961), a facsimile edition of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. P.4.32 (S.C. 2176); T. A. M. Bishop, "An Early Example of Insular Caroline," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 4 (1964-8): 396-400; H. Gouss, "Dunstan und Erabanus Maurus: zur Ms. Bodleian Auctarium P.4.32," *Anglia* 96 (1978): 136-48; M. Lapidge, "St. Dunstan's Latin Poetry," *Anglia* 98 (1980): 101-6. See also n. 17 below.

¹² See in particular C. R. Hart, "The Ramsey Computus," *HR* 85 (1970): 29-44; idem, "Byrthferth and his Manual," *MS* 41 (1972): 93-109; M. Lapidge, "Byrthferth and the Vita S. Ecgwini," *MS* 41 (1979): 31-53, and "Byrthferth of Ramsey and the Early Sections of the *Historia Regum* Attributed to Symeon of Durham," *ASE* 10 (1981): P. S. Baker, "The Old English Canon of Byrthferth of Ramsey," *Speculum* 55 (1980): 22-37.

¹³ Two forthcoming papers, by R. I. Page and M. Lapidge respectively, should do much to enlighten us; they will appear in a volume edited by Nicholas Brooks for the Leicester University Press.

¹⁴ *Varus de Sanctis Eboricensis Ecclesiae*, MGH, Post. Lat. 1: 169-206; esp. pp. 203-4, lines 1340-1356.

¹⁵ See M. R. James, *Lists of MSS formerly in Peterborough Abbey Library* (London, 1926).

¹⁶ See M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), pp. xxxii-xxxiii, for an approach to the fragmentary twelfth-century catalogue from Christ Church, Canterbury, in Cambridge University Library, MS 11.3.12; cf. Kar, *NLGS*, p. 29.

¹⁷ Pierre Courcelle, *La 'Consolation de Philosophie' dans la tradition littéraire* (Paris, 1967), pp. 267-70; Fabio Troncarelli, "Per una ricerca sui commentari altomedievali al *De Consolatione di Boetio*," in *Ricerche in memoria di Giorgio Cantetti* (Torino, 1973), pp. 363-80, *Miscellanea in memoria di Editrice Antevora* (Padova); D. K. Bolton, and a book long in press with Editrice Antevora (Padova) and their sources," *Traditio* 33 (1977): 381-94. I owe to Professor Julian Brown my knowledge of the identification of the hand of "Dunstan" in the glosses to this manuscript.

¹⁸ F. Wormald, *The Utrecht Psalter* (Utrecht, 1853); D. Iselone, "English Manuscript Illustration and the Utrecht Psalter," *Art Bulletin* 41 (1959): 137-49; Guy Dufrenoy, "Les copies anglaises du Psautier d'Utrecht," *Scriptorium* 18 (1964): 183-97, and *Illustration du Psautier d'Utrecht: sources et apport carolingien* (Paris, 1978).

¹⁹ The productive, deliberate search for Breton manuscripts by Léon Fleuriot, *Lectionnaire des glosses en vieux Breton* (Paris, 1964), introduction, is an example of the procedure which would have to be followed.

²⁰ Bishop, *ECW*, p. 17. At least three other copies of Vergil have been attributed to Anglo-Saxon England (Gneuss, nos. 477, 503, and 648), nos. 477 and 503 share a Bury St. Edmunds provenance ca. 1100, when the former (which seems continental to me, not English) was used as paste-downs, while the latter, in insular script perhaps of the tenth century, was palimpsested, both were glossed copies of the *Aeneid*.

²¹ Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, pp. 7, 107-8.

²² Excluding books dated 'aasc. viii/ix' (nine volumes: Gneuss, nos. 45, 432, 443, 456, 635, 647, 780, 885, 911) and 'aasc. ix/x' (three books: Gneuss, nos. 52, 298, 462), I count fifteen in Gneuss' list (nos. 28, 68, 125-27, 282, 327, 375, 385, 448, 576, 611, 626, 857, 898).

²³ *ECW*, pp. xiv, xv, xvi.

²⁴ See his list, *Catalogue*, pp. xiv-xix. But only twenty date from the tenth century, and the last quarter of the eleventh century is (interestingly) almost bare; we therefore have more than a hundred vernacular manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon eleventh century.

²⁵ *MGCB*, pp. xx-xxi.

²⁶ *MGCB*, prefaces, passim.

²⁷ Battle (2), Biddles (1), Hatfield Fuleral/Rogis (1), Lanthony (3), Lewes (1), London (Cripplegate Hospital) (1), Oxford (Carmelites) (1), Shrewsbury (1), Southwick (2), Waltham (1), Windsor (3).

²⁸ E.g. *ECW*, pp. xiv-xv.

²⁹ See the discussion by R. N. Thomson, "The Library of Bury St. Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Speculum* 47 (1972): 617-45.

³⁰ Lambeth Palace MS 362 is the doubtful case. Gneuss does not include Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 120.

³¹ Gneuss, nos. 128, 133-7, 661.

³² Gneuss, nos. 128, 133-4, 136.

³³ Gneuss, nos. 137, 661.

³⁴ "Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts," *TCMS* 1 (1949-53): 432-41; 2 (1954-5): 185-99, 323-36; 3 (1959-63): 93-3, 412-23; 4 (1964-8): 70-7; "An early example of Insular-Caroline," *Ibid.*, 4 (1964-8): 396-400; "The Copenhagen Gospel Book," *Mordisk Tidsskrift for Bogen og Biblioteksvesen* 54 (1967): 33-41; "Lincoln Cathedral MS 182," *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 2 (1967): 73-6, *Archidol. Interidol. Cosmographia: Codex Leidensis Sodalitatis* (Amsterdam, 1966), introduction.

³⁵ *ECW*, pp. xv, xiv.

³⁶ *ECW*, p. xv.

³⁷ E.g. *ECW*, p. 13; more fully in his "Lincoln Cathedral MS 182"

(note 34 above).

³⁸ See, for example, the contributions of Pierre Chaplain in *Prisca monumenta*, ed. Felicity Ringer (London, 1973).

³⁹ *The Diplomas of King Aethelred 'the Unready' 978-1016: A Study of their Use as Historical Evidence* (Cambridge, 1980).

⁴⁰ E.g. *ECW*, pp. xix, 9.

⁴¹ It is not clear whether there was a normal paradigm of the life of a royal chancery scribe at this period. Would he be a trained scribe from an episcopal or monastic scriptorium whom he entered the king's service? If so, we could use his appearance in localized specimens to learn of the centres which contributed personnel to the staff of the royal secretariat. Would he continue of an ecclesiastical least sporadically, as a member of the scriptorium of an ecclesiastical institution during his period of service with the king? Or would his term of royal service, if it did not lead to promotion, come to an end with the result that he then joined an ecclesiastical scriptorium? If so, his appearance in localized specimens would be less useful to us (unless we should suppose that he would return to the place where he entered religion). At present, we can answer none of these questions. Nor can we say whether the royal chancery trained its own new scribes, whether service there might be for life, or whether the chancery had a shifting population of trained scribes seconded from ecclesiastical scriptoria. Progress in dispelling ignorance depends on identifying the work of many charter-scribes in books.

⁴² *ECW*, p. 13.

⁴³ *ECW*, pp. xix, xxi-xxii, xxiv.

⁴⁴ The only arguably Abingdon product of asec. x² would then be BL Cotton Tiberius A.vi, of 977/8, a vernacular manuscript written in Squire miniscula. I hope to discuss the pre-Conquest history of the Abingdon scriptorium and library in another paper.

⁴⁵ In the *English Library before 1700: Studies in its History*, ed. Francis Wormald & C. E. Wright (London, 1938), pp. 15-31.

⁴⁶ Wormald and Wright, p. 16.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

⁴⁹ For the Irish rules, the standard, if rather outdated, *recensurum* is by L. Goussard, "Inventaire des règles monastiques irlandaises," *RSB* 25 (1908): 167-84, 321-33, and 28 (1911) 86-9. There is a catalogue, still of use, by Neufeme, *Manuscrits monastiques* (Antwerp, 1646), t. 1, tract. V, diaq. XVI, p. 38, of pre-Benedictine western monasticism. See also Alber, *Untersuchungen zu den ältesten Monachensystemen* (Gmünd, 1903), and the series of edited *Constitutiones Monasticorum* which he initiated.

⁵⁰ I do not dissent from the conclusions of R. Mayr-Harting, *The Vernacular Rule, the Rule of St. Benedict, and the Carolingian* (Leipzig,

(1977), but wish to see its important findings within the broadest context. Of the thoroughgoing Benedictinism of the tenth-century reform period the manuscript evidence leaves no doubt: we know already of twelve late Anglo-Saxon copies of the Rule (Gosse, nos. 29, 41, 55, 101, 189, 248, 262, 379, 440, 672, 758, and 926), and an eighth-century copy which remained at Worcester (Gosse, no. 631), as well as various copies of Smaragdus's relevant works.

⁵¹ Wormald and Wright, p. 17.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁵³ *Bibliotheca Biblica et lectura de Carême d'après saint Benoît*, "AS 60 (1950): 65-92.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 67, n. 1, referring to M. Van Asseche, "Divinae Vacare Lectiones. De Ratione Studiorum van Sint Benedictus," *SE* 1 (1948): 13-34 (at p. 25, n. 1). On this whole subject see further two important articles by K. Christ: "In Caput Quadragesimae," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 60 (1943): 33-59, and "Mittelalterliche Bibliotheksordnungen für Frauenklöster," *ibid.*, 59 (1942): 1-29.

⁵⁵ Wormald and Wright, p. 27; Bishop, *ECW*, p. xvi, *Ker, NLGB*, pp. 81-5, and Catalogue, pp. xliii-xliiii, xlii.

⁵⁶ The extensive glossing in the extraordinarily large group of manuscripts of Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, found in late Anglo-Saxon England, has recently been made the subject of a preliminary study by D. K. Bolton, "The Study of the Consolation of Philosophy in Anglo-Saxon England," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littraire du moyen âge* 44 (1977): 33-78. The manuscripts are Gosse nos. 12, 23, 68, 193, 347 (OE), 408, 533, 643 (OE), 671, 678, 776, 823, 829, 8867, 887, 899, 901, 908.

⁵⁷ *Ker, Catalogue*, p. xliiii.

⁵⁸ On the Parker Chronicle, see M. B. Parker, *ASE* 5 (1976): 149-71; on the Book of Armagh, Richard Sharpe, forthcoming in *Scriptorium*.

⁵⁹ Bishop, *ECW*, p. xv and n. 1.

⁶⁰ Preface to his translation of St. Gregory's "Pastoral Care." See the study by M. R. Ker, *The Pastoral Care...* (Copenhagen, 1956), a facsimile edition of the earliest manuscripts.

⁶¹ *CCCC*, MS 183. I reject the ascription to Winchester, recently reaffirmed by Tompkins, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, pp. 37-8. See D. W. Bowdler, "The Anglian Collection of Royal Genealogies and Regnal Lists," *ASE* 5 (1976): 23-50.

⁶² J. A. Robinson, *The Times of Saint Dunstan* (Oxford, 1923), pp. 23-80 (esp. 51-71).

⁶³ G. S., 5.13, and *Exordatio*. For Aldfrith, see also Bede, *Historia Abbatum*, 15.

⁶⁴ "England in the Ninth Century: the Crucible of Defeat," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3th Ser., 29 (1978): 1-20.

⁶⁵ In the preface to his "Pastoral Care," on the state of learning in England when he ascended the throne in 871.

⁶⁶ *Ker, Catalogue*, p. 381; Gosse, no. 611.

⁶⁷ "Anglo-Saxon Art after Alfred," *Art Bulletin* 56 (1974) 176-200; "The Leofric Missal and Tenth-Century English Art," *ASE* 6 (1977): 143-73.

⁶⁸ See especially M. B. Parker, "The Palaeography of the Parker Manuscript of the Chronicle...", *ASE* 5 (1976): 149-71.

⁶⁹ *Ker, NLGB*, p. 200.

⁷⁰ In *The Tolleramache Crossus* (*British Museum Additional Manuscript 47967*) (Copenhagen, 1953), p. 13, referring specifically to this, to *CCCC* 173, and to *Watton* 20.

⁷¹ An important study is that by T. A. M. Bishop, "An Early Example of the Square Minuscule," *TCMS* 4 (1964-8): 246-52; cf. his "The Corpus Martianus Capella," *ibid.*, p. 257-75.

⁷² This view was expressed cautiously by C. Flummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel* (2 vols. Oxford, 1892-9), 2: xcvi, but has been stated much more precisely by subsequent writers.

⁷³ The views summarised here are documented in my paper, "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Origins of English Square Minuscule Script," *Anglia*, forthcoming.

⁷⁴ Gosse designates the following manuscripts as foreign: nos. 7, 19, 48, 70, 77, 81, 83, 87, 96, 105, 112, 119-20, 128, 133-7, 140, 148, 179, 211, 245, 263, 266, 279, 281, 283-4, 295, 297, 299, 311-12, 316-17, 334, 354, 361-2, 376, 384, 392, 409, 417-19, 423, 444, 459, 485-6, 489-90, 492, 512-13, 515-16, 521, 529-32, 534, 541, 557, 564-5, 570, 575, 581, 583, 585, 607, 629, 651, 654, 659, 661, 681, 686, 716, 744, 752, 754, 779, 794-5, 801, 804, 809, 834, 869, 908, 939, 944-5.

⁷⁵ I have given a preliminary list of early medieval Breton manuscripts as an appendix to my book cited in the next note.

⁷⁶ This whole movement is discussed in my O'Donnell lectures, *England and the Celtic World in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (publication forthcoming).

⁷⁷ See especially the papers by T. A. M. Bishop cited in n. 71 above. For a Welsh teacher at Winchester in Athelwold's episcopacy, see M. Lapidge, *ASE* 1 (1972): 85-117.

⁷⁸ In addition to the papers of M. Lapidge cited in notes 9 and 12 above, see his "L'influence stylistique de la poésie de Jean Scot," in *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la philosophie* (Colloque du CNRS, 361 [Paris, 1977]) pp. 441-52.

⁷⁹ Gosse, nos. 77, 140, 263, 490, 492, 939.

⁸⁰ Gosse, nos. 311, 383, 661.

⁸¹ *Quessn*, nos. 334, 362. Nos. 423 and 809 are probably Lotharingian.

⁸² *Quessn*, nos. 70, 804. Nos. 112 and 516 are from Saint-Amand.

⁸³ *The English Church 1000-1066: A History of the Later Anglo-Saxon Church* (2nd ed., London, 1979), first published in 1963.

⁸⁴ *ECN*, pp. xi, xxiii.

⁸⁵ *ECN*, p. xviii.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE *DICTA CANDIDI*, *DICTA ALBINI*
AND SOME RELATED TEXTS¹
Christine E. Ineichen-Eder

In a recent article² I presented the first results of research on the contents of the *membra disiecta* of a ninth-century Breton manuscript found in Clm 18961 fols. 25-45, henceforth called B. This miscellaneous codex with school texts, saec. IX-XIII, has been in the monastery of Tegernsee at least since the eleventh century, as corrections made by Tegernsee scribes of that time in the Breton section indicate. The twenty-one folios deriving from Brittany contain a selection of excerpts from Augustine, Boethius, Chalcidius, and Seneca; most of the so-called *Dicta Candidi*; some unknown texts ascribed to the author of the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*; and an Alcuinian catechism which Benedict of Aniane had copied completely in his *Forma Fidei*. A further excerpt seems to have been taken from the commentary to Job by Philippos.³ Thus far, I was able to show that this material is one of a group of typical school codices which contained Lehrmaterial from Alcuin's teaching on the continent. Among this group can also be counted: Munich, Clm 6407 (from Verona, ca. A.D. 800-7)⁴; Paris, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 13953, fol. 45v-46v (France, saec. X; provenance of the codex is Saint-Germain-des-Près «G»⁵; Würzburg, U. B. Mp. theol. fol. 36 (fol. 33v-35v, from Würzburg, first half of the ninth century «W»⁶; and Vat. Reg. 1709 (at least fol. 18v-19r, from France, saec. IX-X)⁷; furthermore a manuscript from Salzburg, saec. IX, which Frobenius Forster had seen, but which is now lost.⁸

I now wish to present, as a continuation of the first paper,⁹ a more detailed study of the *Dicta Candidi* and the two closely related texts (B, texts nos. 10 and 11), ascribed to the same author as the text *De Imagine Dei* (B, text no. 12) in the Breton manuscript.

The *Dicta Candidi* were first discovered as a group of twelve texts by B. Hauréau in 1872¹⁰ in the manuscript from Saint-Germain-des-Près. The first text is entitled *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*, the remaining texts have different headings and themes, such as *De Decem Categoriciis Augustini*, *De Loco*, *De Tempore*, *Propter quid homo factus sit*, etc. No mention of the name Candidus is made in these subsequent titles. At the end of this collection (G, fol. 46vb) an eighteenth-century hand had made the note: *Nectonus Candidus de imagine Dei*. This incorrect¹¹ subscription no doubt had encouraged Hauréau to publish all twelve texts under the title of *Dicta Candidi*.¹² In 1890, O. C. Th. Richter drew attention to the fact that *Dictum I (De Imagine Dei)* had been transmitted in the now lost ninth-century manuscript from Salzburg (=S) used by Probenius Forster.¹³

Hauréau had tentatively identified Candidus, mentioned in the title of the first text, with Candidus-Brun of Fulda. This opinion was accepted by later scholars: P. Zimmermann¹⁴ was led to believe that he had found further evidence for this view when he discovered that the text of *Dictum I* had just been published by E. Dümmler as an anonymous letter addressed to the emperor (with a note to Einhard asking him to check the correctness of the content).¹⁵ Finally, Professor H. Löwe¹⁶ discovered the *Dicta Candidi Presbyteri de Imagine Dei* together with the *Dicta Albini Diaconi de Imagine Dei* in the Verona manuscript that had been written around A.D. 800, under the supervision and participation of the archdeacon, Pacificus of Verona. Löwe made it plausible that the contents of this manuscript had been copied from a codex used in Alcuin's school and that the much discussed Candidus referred to in V and G could only be Candidus-Wise, the Anglo-Saxon disciple of Alcuin.¹⁷

However, Löwe also expressed doubt about the authenticity of the twelve *Dicta*¹⁸ for the following reasons: (1) only the title of the first *Dictum* mentions the name Candidus; (2) the *Dicta Candidi Presbyteri* and the *Dicta Albini Diaconi* have also been transmitted as one tractate entitled *De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae*, attributed to Ambrose;¹⁹ and (3) in the *Libri Carolini*, the "*Dicta Albini*" have been quoted extensively as a work of Ambrose.²⁰

With respect to (3), the following may at least be pointed out, though a final satisfactory solution to the entire question of the *Dicta Albini* has not yet been found. *Libri Carolini* I, 7 contains a short introduction to the topic: *quod nam ad adorandas imagines pertinet*,

quod scriptum est. Creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam. Then follow two quotations attributed to Ambrose and Augustine. Both these excerpts are quite long. The entire citation from Augustine consists of his *De Diversis Questionibus*, ch. 51. The excerpt from Ambrose begins with a short quotation for his *De Fide*, I, 7, but is then followed by a long excerpt from the *Dicta Albini* without any indication that a different author is being quoted. According to the structure of the chapter, it is quite obvious that the concise introduction was meant to be succeeded and confirmed by quotations from authorities, i.e., Ambrose and Augustine. The *Dicta Albini* are, in fact, absorbed into the quotation from Ambrose.²¹ Since the *Libri Carolini* were written by Theodulf of Orleans,²² it is hard to believe that he would misquote a work of Alcuin. Paul Meyvaert suggested that Theodulf may possibly have found Ambrose's *De Fide* I, 7 already inflated by the so-called *Dicta Albini*.²³ Still unexplained is the question why and when the *Dicta Albini* were ascribed to Alcuin.²⁴ Löwe's suggestion²⁵ that they may have been presented orally by Alcuin, again, comes to mind.

Regarding (1), a number of observations are in order. In B, the Candidus text (G, no. 1) is simply headed by the words: *Item Rindow de Imagine Dei*. Two as yet unknown texts precede the supposed Candidus text and are also entitled *Item Rindow[is]*, thus suggesting that all three texts originated from the same author. Of another text preceding this little group of synonyms, only a very short fragment is left at the beginning of the gathering. Hence, the author's name has not been transmitted in B.

Since Hauréau's edition, the numeration of the *Dicta* has always followed the sequence of texts in G. V and B, however, give the texts in a different order, interspersed with other texts, while W contains only notes.²⁶ and 2, 2 contains only notes 10 and 11. The order of texts in V is: 2, 10, 12, 4, 1, 9, 11, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8; the order of texts in B is: 1, 2, 6, 5, 7, 8, 4, 10 and 12 (*Dictum I* and *Dictum II* are omitted).

Dictum I is entitled in B, V, and G *De Decem Categoriciis Augustini*, it is a correct copy of Augustine's *De Trinitate* 5.2.3 and 5.1.2 (in that order). In other words, the author, Augustine, has been named correctly and Candidus is not the author. In V and B, the *Dicta* are embedded in a collection of excerpts, quotations, and added explanations which are all copied in the same manner as the *Dicta Candidi* and the *Dicta Albini*. A simple heading designates the content of the passage

and indicates the author, when known.

In each of the twelve *Dicta* a different theological or philosophical question is addressed; whereas, in the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei* (*Dictum* 1) and the *Dicta Albani de Imagine Dei*, the same topic is discussed.

From this evidence it is obvious that we are not justified in naming all twelve *Dicta* as one single group of *Dicta Candidi*. The title *Dicta Candidi* can only have been intended for the first text (*De Imagine Dei*) just as the title *Dicta Albani* was attached to one specific text only.

The remaining texts (G, 2-12)²⁷ can be divided into two groups: (1) short texts (nos. 2 and 4-8; among these should be included B, no 25 = V, fol. 98r, to a great extent copied verbatim from an authority that gives definitions of basic philosophic concepts; and (2) longer texts (G, 3 and 9-12) intended to prove certain philosophic truths, based on the teachings of either Augustine or Claudianus Mamertus, but also showing the author's own philosophic development of those particular questions.

To group (1) belong the following texts: G 2, *De Divina Categoria Augustini*, is, as shown above, a direct copy from St. Augustine; G 5, *Quomodo Quid Sit*, is taken verbatim from Claudianus;²⁸ the wording of the beginning of G 6, *De Substantia*, can be found in Isidore,²⁹ the text G 7, *De Loco*, is formulated independently but the central thought is obviously based on Claudianus;³⁰ text G 8, *De Tempore*, also phrased originally, seems to be primarily dependent on Augustine;³¹ G 4 *Utrum Secundum Tempus an Secundum Excellentiam Deus est Ante Tempus*, although placed before texts 5-8 in G, really is a sequence to G 3 and is composed in accordance with Augustine;³² text B 25, *De Loco Dei*, is again excerpted from Augustine.³³ Such short and general texts were most likely meant for memorization by students, and the teacher, who partly excerpted and partly phrased them himself, saw no need or justification for attaching his name to them.

Group (2) consists of these texts: G 3 *Si Possit Verum Esse Sine Veritate* is obviously dependent on Augustine³⁴ and Claudianus.³⁵ However, the author does not slavishly follow the thoughts of his predecessors, but develops his own argument to prove that truth itself is not a body,³⁶ G 9, *Propter Quid Homo Factus Sit*, shows that man's happiness consists in knowing the highest good, God. Knowledge of God is eternal life,³⁷ but in order to know God, one must first know God's image, man. Though

based on Augustine³⁸ and Claudianus,³⁹ the author expresses his own ideas on the topic. G 10, *Quomodo Sancta et Sempiterna atque Incommutabilis Sit Trinitas*, begins with a quotation from Augustine and then continues to explain in words different from those of Augustine and Claudianus the unity of, yet distinction between, *esse*, *nosse*, and *amare*; and of *essentia*, *sapientia*, and *caritas*.⁴⁰ At the end of the text, the author uses the word *inlocaliter* with reference to the soul. An expression in psychology which is particularly characteristic of Claudianus and may have been developed by him.⁴¹ G 11, *Quomodo modum Propter Possit Esse Inlocaliter*, reveals in the title its debt to Claudianus. The introductory sentence *Quae superius esse, nosse atque amare nuncupavi*... refers back directly to text 10. Thus we know that texts 10 and 11 were meant to be together, even though they are not always transmitted together or in that order. Only G gives them in the intended sequence. Text 11 combines, again, the doctrine of Augustine and Claudianus.⁴² In G 12, *Quo Argumento Colligendum Sit Deus Esse*, based like the previous texts on Augustine⁴³ and Claudianus,⁴⁴ expressed in shorter and more precise form the ideas that were the didactic aim of the religious catechism⁴⁵ transmitted together with these texts in G, V, and B. The two texts are so closely connected in content, though not in style and method, that one can only imagine that either one was the source of the other, or that both were composed simultaneously.

The study of the eleven texts edited by Mauréau (together with the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*) has shown that there is an underlying plan and a certain cohesion among these texts. The short ones, primarily excerpts (G 2 and 4-8 as well as B 25) establish basic concepts; the longer ones (G 3 and 9-12), based on Augustine and Claudianus, are written in a simple, dialectical, and precise style of language, and their vocabulary and sentence structure are alike. Hence, they may originate from the same author who refers to himself in text G 11. This hypothesis is confirmed, to a great extent, by the manuscript tradition, which shows that these texts are often transmitted together in a larger group (a.s., in V, B, and O), preferably in connection with the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*. The purpose of the collection was obviously to give students simple and concise guidelines for some of the basic metaphysical problems connected with the study of theology.

As mentioned above, the *Dicta de Imagine Dei*, ascribed to Albani, and those ascribed to Candidus are also transmitted as one single unit attributed to Ambrose.⁴⁶ In this version the two texts are combined in

a single letter addressed by a teacher to his beloved student (*dilectissime fili*).⁴⁷ When one compares the redaction of the letter with that of the two *Dicta*, slight text variations are evident: e.g., some biblical quotations and the addresses to the student (in the letter) are missing in the two *Dicta*. The question of chronology necessarily arises.

The *Dicta Candidi* and the so-called *Dicta Albini* were promulgated at the continental school of Alcuin. The *terminus post quem* for the redaction of the *Dicta Candidi* is the year 791, when Candidus came to Alcuin's school at the royal palace for the first time. However, the transmission of the text of the *Dicta Albini* is older since the *Libri Carolini*, in which extensive sections of it are attributed to Ambrose,⁴⁸ were finished in 791. Later, between the years 798 and 814, Bishop Leidrad of Lyons had a complete corpus of dialectical works copied from an Alcuinian school codex for his cathedral school;⁴⁹ among these texts were also the *Dicta Albini* and *Dicta Candidi* together, lacking, however, title and attribution (fol. 106v f.).

Obviously the text generally known as *Dicta Albini* and quoted in the *Libri Carolini* has the earliest tradition,⁵⁰ whereas the oldest manuscript transmission of the *Dicta Candidi* dates back to about 800 A.D. (in V), several years after the *Libri Carolini* had been completed. The combination of the two texts, though without title and author, occurred already in the very beginning of the ninth-century (in the Leidrad Codex). The later attribution of this combined text to Ambrose was most likely promulgated by the scription in the *Libri Carolini* or the textual source of *Libri Carolini* 1.37.

A study of the two *Dicta* reveals that they must have been written by two different people, so that also from this point of view the redaction of the *Dicta* must have preceded that of the letter.⁵¹ The text of the *Dicta Albini* is based on the scriptural passage: *Faciamus hominibus ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram* (Gen. 1.26) and accordingly consists of two sections, one explaining man as the image of God, the other showing man's similitude to God. Both expositions are based on esagoge and emphasize the ethical nature of the soul and man's need to practise the virtues (here called *dispositio animae*) of charity, goodness, justice, patience, meekness, mercy, and cleanness of heart - a topic very dear to Alcuin. Hence an ascription of this text to Alcuin was not made without some justification.⁵²

The *Dicta Candidi* (written from a strictly dialectical and metaphysical point of view) sound like a complement to the *Dicta Albini*.

The soul, the interior man, is discussed *qua* soul. It is called either *mens* or *anima*, depending on which of its functions the author refers to: that of knowing (*mens*) or that of vivifying the body (*anima*). Just as God's nature is threefold - He Who is (*ipse ex quo*), Wisdom (*sapientia*) and Love (*dilectio*) with which He adhere to Wisdom (or: begotten by Him, and Holy Ghost) - thus also the soul is threefold - the father, Son, and Holy Ghost - thus also the soul is threefold - the soul itself, i.e. substance (*mens*), the knowledge it conceives (*scientia*), and the love (*amor*) with which it is attached to its knowledge. The text reveals its debt to Augustine⁵³ and Claudianus.⁵⁴ Once the author uses the expression *in nostris scripturis* when he explains that love, *amor*, is *est caritas*, is the Holy Spirit; he is evidently placing the Christian writings in contrast to the Roman classics where the word *amor* has a different connotation. The author is writing within a typical school context. The language of this text is quite different from that of the other *Dicta*. The metaphysical thoughts are expressed in a very distinctive and differentiating language: e.g. whereas the author of the *Dicta Albini* uses the word *sapere* for God's as well as the soul's activity, the author of the *Dicta Candidi* differentiates *sapere*, God's activity, from *scire*, the soul's activity. Since the most important manuscripts attribute the text to Candidus, and no reason appears for doubting this attribution, we may indeed be justified in ascribing the text to Candidus-Wise.⁵⁵

The next question is whether Candidus can also be considered the author and compiler of texts G2-12 and B25, as often transmitted in connection with his *Dicta*. Manuscript tradition does not attribute them to him. However, there are several reasons for assuming that these texts (as a collection) also derived from Candidus:

1. The *Dicta Candidi* and the text collection are based primarily on the same sources, Augustine and Claudianus Musertus, yet apart from the direct excerpts both also show the author's independent development of philosophical ideas. The author's own thoughts in the different texts are complementary, not contradictory.
2. There is unity of style in texts G3, 4, 7-12 and the *Dicta Candidi*. The style is much simpler than that of Augustine or Claudianus, but also lacks the gentleness and subtlety of Alcuin's style. Instead, it is appropriate for the expression of a factual discourse on metaphysical questions. The syntax of the sentences is simple, dialectical, and similar in all texts. Certain choices of vocabulary place the author in the milieu of the Anglo-Saxon tradition.⁵⁶
3. The underlying theme of all texts is that of incorporeity: if the soul were not incorporeal, it could not be the image of God who is incorporeal *per se* essential.⁵⁷

With these considerations as a basis, one can assume that Candidus-Wiso was not only the composer of the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei* but also the compiler of the collection of texts G 2-12 and B 25, some of which he most likely wrote himself.

Finally, the fragment and the two texts immediately preceding the *Dicta Candidi* in B⁵⁸ deserve special study. By the title *Item Eiusdem*, texts B 10 and 11 are ascribed to the same author as the following *Dicta Candidi*, here entitled: *Item Eiusdem de Imagine Dei*. It is noteworthy that in B texts entitled with an author's name were generally attributed correctly. Consequently, we may assume that the designations *Item Eiusdem* are also used consciously. Apart from the fragment B 9⁵⁹ - an incomplete sentence that nevertheless reveals its dependence on St. Augustine⁶⁰ - the first of the two texts (B 10) is a rather short piece on the Trinity and is reminiscent of Augustine;⁶¹ similar expressions are also found in Alcuin's *De Trinitate*.⁶² The second text (B 11) is fairly long and treats of wisdom, sapientia, as the Son of God, the second person of the Trinity. The last part of B 11⁶³ is also found in V (fol. 118v) as an individual text, without designation of an author: it is an explanation of the unity in the Trinity found in corporeal and incorporeal substances and is based almost entirely on Claudianus⁶⁴ and the often cited passage, Sap. 11: 21.⁶⁵ This exposition may originally have been a separate text, as the other texts in G. The first part of B 11, however, shows dependence on Alcuin,⁶⁶ whereas its style is similar to that of B 10 as well as to the *Dicta Candidi*. Since the manuscript tradition attributes the texts B 10 and 11 (and by inference also B 9) to the author of the *Dicta Candidi*, the evidence suggests that they, too, were composed by Candidus-Wiso.

If these observations, inferences, and conclusions presented in this paper are correct, then we can say that Candidus-Wiso's role as a theologian is appearing in a new light.⁶⁷ Whereas previously we knew him only as Alcuin's pupil, friend and emissary, he is now emerging as a scholar of theology in his own right - and I may be permitted to echo this with all the more certainty now that I have just shown that he (and not Candidus-Heun of Fulda) is also the author of the *Opusculum de Passionibus Domini* and of the letter *Sanctus Christus Corporalis Oculis Deum Videre Potuerit*.⁶⁸

From the material discussed in the present paper Candidus-Wiso's authorship can be claimed for the following smaller texts: *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei* (G 1 = B 12 = V, fol. 100v), *Si Possit Verum Esse Sine*

veritate (G 3 = V, fol. 103r), *Utrum Secundum Tempus an Secundum Excellentiam Deus Est Ante Tempore* (G 4 = B 26 = V, fol. 98r), *De Loco* (G 7 = B 23 = V, fol. 104r), *De Tempore* (G 8 = B 24 = V, fol. 104r), *Propter Quid Hoc Factus Sit* (G 9 = B 30 = V, fol. 102v), *Quomodo Sancta et sempiterna atque incommutabilia Sit Trinitas* (G 10 = B 27 = V, fol. 94r), *Quomodo Probari Possit Esse Inlocaliter* (G 11 = V, fol. 102v), *Quo Argumento Colligendum Sit Deum Esse* G 12 = B 28 = V, fol. 94v); as well as for the texts B 10 and 11 (on the Trinity and divine wisdom), which have no other title than *Item Eiusdem*, and for the fragment B 9 (only the ending of B 11 is transmitted also in V, fol. 118v, beginning with: *Nulla est unitas...*). Each of these texts discusses only one particular problem in short and succinct language, as is appropriate for school purposes. Although the author bases his ideas on the works of his predecessors in theology, particularly Augustine and Claudianus Mamertus, as well as Alcuin, he presents the ideas in most cases in a new garment as it were: not only is his style of language different from that of previous theologians, but he sees and solves problems in the light of the theological issues of the time of Charlemagne. In other words, he opens up new dimensions for old problems. The same may be said of the other two works by Candidus-Wiso, the *Opusculum* and the letter, mentioned above. Although these are not written for school purposes - the *Opusculum* is for a group of brethren living together in some form of community; the letter is an answer to a specific theological question raised by someone rather advanced in theological thinking - they betray the same characteristics as the shorter articles written as "Lehrmaterial": (1) the dialectical and metaphysical (rather than allegorical and analogical) approach to theological questions; (2) the obvious influence from the works of Augustine, Claudianus Mamertus, and Alcuin; (3) the Carolingian set of "glasses" through which the problems are seen; and (4) the simple and straightforward style of language.

The use of Claudianus' work *De Statu Animae* is rather a significant mark for all of Candidus' works. Since that text was not very widely disseminated,⁶⁹ Candidus-Wiso may have been one of the first scholars in Carolingian times to have made such extensive use of Claudianus' text and he may have been instrumental in making them seem a little more popular. Finally it should be said that in future research, Candidus-Wiso deserves more attention than he has hitherto received; it may well be that further works (e.g. sermons) or aspects of his activities may yet come to light.

NOTE²

¹As I was preparing this paper for the York Conference on Insular Latin I found out that John Marenbon, then a doctoral student of Professor Peter Dronke and Michael Lapidge, had also recently been working on this topic, though within a larger frame of reference (*From Alcuin to Brugnans*). My own researches go as far back as 1965, but I could not start to publish until 1978 (see n. 2). Supported by the special encouragement of Professor Dronke, I did not withdraw my paper from the conference. Later on J. Marenbon sent me that section of his dissertation that deals with the *Dicta Candidi*. We saw that our conclusions regarding the origin of the *Dicta* were quite different. I had thought that the texts in question belonged to an earlier period, whereas J. Marenbon ascribed them to Candidus-Wiso, the disciple of Alcuin. Prompted by our differences and by critical and interested questions expressed by the conference members, I reconsidered the problems once more and was finally convinced that I did not have sufficient evidence for my thesis and that, consequently, I could only agree basically with Marenbon's conclusion. I am now presenting the same material with a somewhat different perspective and with a few more details. Marenbon's thesis, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Studies in the Use of Logic by the Philosophers of the Early Middle Ages*, will be published by the Cambridge University Press, presumably in 1981.

²C. E. Inkehen-Eder, "Theologische und philosophische Lehrmaterial aus dem Alkuin-Kreis," *Deutsches Archiv* 34 (1978): 192-201 (henceforth cited as: *Lehrmaterial*). In this article I had announced (n. 51) that I would present a more detailed study on the *Dicta Candidi* together with a new edition of the texts. The present article is a partial fulfillment of the proposed study; the texts will now be edited by J. Marenbon in connection with his thesis, in a broader context.

³For a detailed description of contents (texts numbered 1-30), see *Lehrmaterial*, pp. 194-97. In a letter of January 1979, Marenbon informed me that text no. 13 was taken from Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* 22.20.

⁴Cf. B. Bischoff, *Die spätantiken Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, 2nd ed. (Münchener, 1960) p. 149f. and R. Löwe, "Zur Geschichte Wisos," *Deutsches Archiv* 6 (1943): pp. 363-73 (henceforth cited as: *Wiso*).

⁵L. Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits latins conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale sous les numéros 8823-10613* (1867-1871), 9: 1133f. Paleographical dating was received orally from Professor B. Bischoff in 1970.

⁶B. Bischoff and J. Hofmann, *Libri R. Zylani* (Würzburg, 1952), pp. 18, 32f. and 179f.

⁷My sincere thanks are due to John Contreni, who was so kind as to inform me of this MS and who also gave me his photocopies of fols. 16r-23v, which contain texts 3 27 and 28. The Regimenseis apparently contains fragments from Fleury; cf. E. Dümmler, "Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der lateinischen Dichtung aus der Zeit der Karolinger, III," *Neues Archiv* 4 (1878-1879): 532.

⁸Cf. FL 101: 1316 and Löwe, *Wiso*, p. 363 f.

⁹Cf. *Lehrmaterial*, p. 200, n. 51.

¹⁰See above, n. 5.

¹¹Only *Dictum* 1 discusses the theme *De Imagine Dei*.

¹²Had he known of their different transmissions in other Carolingian manuscripts, he would most probably have come to a different conclusion.

¹³Cf. above, n. 8. See also Frobenius Forster, *Opera Alouini* (1777), 2: 596.

¹⁴"Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Urhohenstolastik," *Divus Thomas* 7 (1929): 30-60. Further literature on the *Dicta Candidi* in *Lehrmaterial*, p. 193, no. 10. See also F. Brühl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, (1975), 1: 287f. and 349.

¹⁵*MGH Epistolae*, 5: 615f.

¹⁶Cf. above, n. 4.

¹⁷*Wiso*, p. 364f.

¹⁸*Wiso*, p. 370.

¹⁹PL 17: 1105-1108. Another late medieval tradition attributes the same text to Augustine under the title *De Creatione primi hominis* (PL 100: 365; Löwe, *Wiso*, p. 369, n. 1).

²⁰*Libri Carolini* 1.7 (*MGH Legum sectio 3, Concilia* 7, Suppl., pp. 22f.).

²¹It should be remembered that Ambrose, in his *Hexameron* 6.7.40 - 6.10.76 (ed. C. Schenkl, 1897, *ChrL* 32: 231-261) gave a long exposition on the very topic of the *Dicta Albi*. Since the *Dicta Albi* do indeed express some of his thoughts, e.g., that the virtues, particularly sapientia and iustitia, reveal the image of God, an attribution of this text of the *Dicta Albi* to Ambrose was not entirely far-fetched. Marenbon first interpreted the text of the *Dicta Albi* as "authorial commentary and expansion" in the *Libri Carolini* (ch. 2: "Logic and Theology at the Palace School of Charlemagne"), but he communicated to me that he has now been convinced through Paul Meyvaert's "Observations" in *AS* 89 (1979): 26-37, that "there really is no case for thinking Alcuin the author of the *Libri Carolini*."

²²Cf. A. Freeman, "Further Studies in the *Libri Carolini* III: The Marginal Notes in Vaticanus Latinus 7207 *Synonyma* 44 (1971): 597-612. See also below, n. 50.

23. In a letter dated May 2, 1980, P. Meyvaert kindly answered my doubts regarding the authorship of the Dicta Albini with the following explanations: "The author of L. C. clearly thought he was presenting a single, long, uninterrupted quotation from Ambrose. It seems obvious that the source used by the L. C. author already had the conflation of the court correctors of the Vatican MS [Vatic. Lat. 7207] have been unaware that L. C. 1, 7 was citing Alcuius? I find this hard to believe.. Alcuius knew and used the Dicta "x" de Imagine Dei.. but the Dicta "x" de Imagine Dei uses a very distinctive vocabulary to designate the faculties of the soul (intellect, memory and will) as the dignitates animae.. it is also striking that this does not appear to be Alcuius's own vocabulary." I wish to take this opportunity to express special thanks to Paul Meyvaert for having considered this question in such detail. He has, moreover, promised to give this problem special attention in his further studies on the *Liber Carolinus* and on Alcuius.

24. It should be mentioned that parts of the Dicta Albini have also been cited anonymously as part of a letter of Pope Anacletus in the *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae* (ed. P. Hinschius, 1863, p. 72, Ep. 1, par. 13) - a reference from Professor B. Bischoff from 1971. Just as texts G 12 (=B 28) and B 29, the religious catechism (cf. *Lehrmaterial* p. 197, nn. 32 and 33), so also the Dicta Albini were later quoted in the *Monumenta Fidei* by Benedict of Aniane. Cf. J. Leclercq, "Les 'Monumenta Fidei' de Saint Benoît d'Aniane," *Scudia Anselmiana* 20, (1948) p. 36.9; p. 37.40: *Primo quidem quia sicuti Deus unus semper ubique totus est...quo praesentem eum non habet memoria.* (PL 100: 566B-567B.). I owe this reference to P. Meyvaert in 1980.

25. *Miso*, p. 368.

26. It is absorbed into an anonymous letter; see above n. 15.

27. Henceforth, I shall use the name Dicta only for the two texts ascribed to Candidus and "Alcuius" and refer to the others simply as texts of G (counted according to Maur's edition), B (counted according to my enumeration in *Lehrmaterial*, pp. 194-197) or V (as described in *Miso*, pp. 368-370).

28. *De Statu Animae* 3.3. Most of the references to Claudianus were already pointed out by Zimmerman, "Beitrag" (see n. 14), pp. 57ff. The text G 5 is also cited in the supplement to the *Monumenta Fidei* (cf. Leclercq, p. 53).

29. *Stymologias* 2.26.6. Text G 6 is also found in the supplement to the *Monumenta Fidei* (cf. Leclercq, p. 54). The explicit given in *Lehrmaterial*, p. 197, should read: *non illa in aliis vel de aliis.*

30. *De Statu Animae* 2.5.

31. *Confessiones* 11.13-27. A similar thought, probably based in Augustine, is found in Claudianus, *De Statu Animae* 2.2. The five definitions of G 2 and G 3-B are, of course, discussed in Boethius, *In Categoriae Aristotelis* 1 and 2.

32. *Confessiones* 11.13-27.

33. *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 1.20. Quoted in *Liber Carolinus* 1.27. Cf. *Miso*, *Miso*, p. 369.

34. *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 1.9: *Strum corporeis sensibus percipi veritas possit.*

35. *De Statu Animae* 1.14: *Spiritualia corporeis oculis videri non posse: ibid., 3.9: Quod multum distat inter visionem oculorum et visionem animae, esp. par. 2. See also below n. 68.*

36. The nature of the proof is such that I wonder if the title has been transmitted correctly (B, G, and V do show many scribal errors) and it should not perhaps read: *Si possit corpus verum esse sine veritate.*

37. Jo. 17.3.

38. *Confessiones* 13.22.31; *Soliloquia* 1.3.

39. *De Statu Animae* 1.27.

40. The quotation is taken from Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* 11.26 (CSEL 40: 550). The entire text shows dependence on Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* 11.26-28; *idem*, *De Trin.* 6.3; and Claudianus, *De Statu Animae* 3.3, 14. Cf. Dicta Albini, PL 100: 366.

41. Cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* VII, 1, 1 (1934-64), col. 386. See also A. Engelbrecht, "Untersuchungen über die Sprache des Claudianus Mamertus," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 110 (1885): 423-542.

42. Augustine, *De Trin.* 10; *De Civ. Dei* 10.27. Claudianus, *De Statu Animae* 1.24.26; 2.6. The word *consilium* (instead of *intellectus* or *notitia*) points particularly to Claudianus as source.

43. *De Libero Arbitrio* 2.3. Cf. Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 2.6.16 (Brühl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 1: 228).

44. *De Statu Animae* 2.2.

45. Cf. *Lehrmaterial*, p. 199f. The catechism will also be edited by John Norenson in the above mentioned thesis.

46. See above, n. 19.

47. The Dicta Albini constitute ch. 1, the beginning of ch. 2, and the entire ch. 3 of the letter; the Dicta Candidi make up the rest of ch. 2 (PL 17: 1103 [inc.]); *Et ideo, dilectissimam fili, iuxta mihi videtur... (Expl., ibid., col. 1107): Nec de imagine, o dilectissimam fili, habeto.*

48. See above nn. 20, 21, and 23.

49. Cf. L. Delisle, *Notices et extraits* 35, 2 (1897): 834; B. Bischoff, "Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen," in: *Karl der Grosse, 3. Des Geistes Leben*, ed. B. Bischoff (1965), p. 48; *idem* in: *Karl der Grosse, Werk und Wirkung* (Aachen, 1963), catalogue no. 343.

LES VIES DE SAINTS BRETONS LES PLUS ANCIENNES DANS LEURS RAPPORTS
AVEC LES ILES BRITANNIQUES
François Kerlouégan
Université de Besançon

Les Vies de saints bretons les plus anciennes - c'est-à-dire antérieures à l'exode des reliques et du clergé devant les invasions normandes au Xe siècle, ce qui correspond en gros à la fin de la période carolingienne - forment un ensemble important à la fois par leur nombre et par leur date et de ce fait occupent une place de choix dans le groupe des Vies celtiques.¹ Pourtant, si leur édition, commencée au XVIIe siècle par Albert Le Grand, continuée au XVIIIe siècle par Dom Lobineau, a été reprise autour des années 1900 par La Borderie, Ferdinand Lot, Robert Fawtier et quelques autres, si leur étude scientifique a connu un développement certain avec des derniers érudits, auxquels il faut joindre à la première place le chanoine François Duime, elles semblent ensuite être plus ou moins retombées dans un oubli qu'elles ne méritent pas, encore que depuis une quinzaine d'années l'attention des spécialistes se porte à nouveau sur elles. Depuis 1925 en effet, date du livre de R. Largillière, *Les saints et l'organisation chrétienne primitive de l'Armorique bretonne*, il faut surtout signaler quelques travaux de chanoine Dobie, en particulier sur Paul Aurélien,² puis en 1966 un article de synthèse de F. Riché sur les premières hagiographies bretonnes,³ un chapitre d'E. G. Bowen dans *Saints, Monks and Settlements in the Celtic Lands* en 1969,⁴ un article de F. Morvanneau sur "Guénolé et Guénès" en 1974,⁵ et un article de Québécois Joseph-Claude Foulon intitulé "Hagiographie et politique: La Première Vie de Saint Samson de Dol" en 1977.⁶ Remarquons au passage que ce sont surtout des historiens qui se sont jusqu'ici intéressés aux Vies et que les latinistes brillent encore par leur absence.

La recherche dans ce domaine reste donc largement ouverte. Aussi, puisque le thème proposé à la Conférence concerne les Iles, je voudrais

relever dans les Vies toutes les indications, directes ou indirectes, qui s'y rapportent (personnes, lieux, usages) et montrer par la conjonction de ces notations de valeur diverse que cette série de documents confirme l'existence des liens qui pendant tout le haut Moyen Âge, comme nous le savons par d'autres sources, unissaient les Bretons du Continent à leurs frères de Grande-Bretagne et à leurs cousins irlandais.

Dans ma première partie, je m'arrêterai sur les saints venus des Îles, c'est-à-dire sur ce que les auteurs des Vies nous disent de leur terre d'origine, de leur famille, de leurs lieux de séjour, de leurs déplacements.

Ensuite je m'attacherai aux rédacteurs des Vies en question: comment se sont-ils informés sur la partie insulaire de la vie de leur saint? que nous disent-ils plus généralement sur les Îles?

Enfin je montrerai que les Vies font apparaître, chez les Bretons du haut Moyen Âge, certains traits de civilisation et de culture qui se rattachent nettement à l'ensemble insulaire.⁷

•

• •

Puisqu'il s'agit de récits à prétention biographique, il est normal que nous nous occupions d'abord de héros de chacune de ces Vies. Sur les dix saints présentés dans les quatorze textes recensés, six nous intéressent ici puisqu'ils sont d'origine insulaire: Guénolé, Magloire, Malo, Paul Aurélien, Samson et Tudual. Je leur adjointrai Guénelli, saint continental qui a voyagé dans les Îles.

Trois de ces Vies sont d'auteur connu. Celle de Guénolé a été écrite à Landévenec après 857 par le moine Clément et amplifiée par l'abbé Wrdisten avant 884.⁸ Celle de Paul est due à Wrmuoc, disciple d'Wrdisten, qui date son œuvre de 884.⁹ Quant à celle de Malo, nous en avons une version de Bili, clerc d'Alet, écrite dans la seconde moitié du IX^e siècle.¹⁰

Trois ont été rédigées par des anonymes localisables: la Vie de Magloire, par un moine de Lohou, dans la seconde moitié du IX^e siècle ou plutôt au début du X^e siècle;¹¹ celle de Tudual, par un moine de Tréguier, après 884;¹² la Vie prima de Samson enfin, due à un moine de Dol mais dont la date reste aujourd'hui encore discutée et comprise dans une fourchette allant de 610-615 à la première moitié du IX^e siècle.¹³ Inversement la Vie seconde se situe dans la seconde moitié

de ce siècle mais pour Duine son auteur est un Dolois, pour Fawtier, un moine de Pental, en Neustrie.¹⁴

Quant aux deux dernières Vies, elles sont l'une et l'autre d'un anonyme de localisation non précisée. Il s'agit de la Vie de Guénelli, successeur de Guénolé à Landévenec, de la seconde moitié du IX^e siècle ou du milieu de X^e siècle¹⁵ et de la Vie de Malo par l'Anonyma, de la seconde moitié du IX^e siècle.¹⁶

Cette présentation faite, venons-en à l'origine de nos saints. Samson est né (in) *Demetiana patria*, c'est-à-dire dans le Dyfed. Son père, Amou, est lui-même originaire de cette province; sa mère, Anna, vient d'une région plus difficile à identifier, probablement plus à l'Est. Tous les deux appartiennent à une famille noble.¹⁷

Magloire est doublement le cousin de Samson. Son père, Umbrophal, est en effet le frère cadet d'Amou et sa mère, Afrella, la sœur cadette d'Anna. Mais son biographe ne nous dit rien de précis sur le lieu de sa naissance, sinon qu'il s'agit de la Bretagne transmarine.¹⁸

C'est d'une région appelée Uuenti, c'est-à-dire Ovent, qu'est originaire Malo. Son père a pour nom Uuento; c'est un noble, fondateur de Guinicastrum. Par sa mère, Beruuala, il est le cousin des précédents, puisqu'elle est la sœur de leurs pères. On nous précise même le lieu de sa naissance: in uelle quae dicitur Caruenna, dit l'Anonyma, in uelle quae dicitur Hantoarum. Écrit Bili: c'est Hentcarven, aujourd'hui Llanccarfen.¹⁹

Paul, d'après Wrmuoc, est le fils d'un homme nommé Perphirius et il est né dans la presqu'île de Penn Ouen, à l'ouest de Cardiff. Mais Wrmuoc nous dit aussi que ses huit frères et ses trois sœurs sont élevés à Brehat dinot (gutter *reouptaculi pygmae*).²⁰ La chanoine Dolba a montré qu'Wrmuoc a confondu deux personnages de son voisin: un Paulus de Penychen et un saint Paulinus de Carterham.²¹ Quel qu'il en soit, il s'agit bien d'un saint gallois.

De Tudual, nous savons seulement qu'il est le fils de Fompala, sœur d'un homme de Grande-Bretagne nommé Nigulius qui émigre en Bretagne et que Tudual prit la même chemise.²² Notons que la Vie seconde, de X^e siècle, en fait un Irlandais.²³

Guénolé est le seul des six à ne pas être né dans l'Île. Mais son père, Francus, cousin du roi Getauius, est originaire de Dommonia et il émigre avec sa femme Alba Trimaana (Queen Tairbhren) et ses deux fils en Bretagne, où naît le petit Guénolé.²⁴

Dès que leur intelligence est suffisamment ouverte - et cela se produit évidemment très tôt - les *sancti pueri* sont confiés à un moine non moins saint en vue de leur éducation.

Le plus fameux de ces maîtres, celui auquel on attribue le plus d'élèves, est Ilut. Ainsi Wmonoc nous apprend que le jeune Paul fréquente son école avec trois autres saints fameux, Samson, dont nous savons déjà par son biographe qu'il a été le disciple du maître, Dewi et Gildas, auxquels il faut joindre Magloire, si nous en croyons le moine de Lehem.²⁵ Malo, lui, est élevé par l'Irlandais Brendan et aura l'honneur d'être voyageur.²⁶

Où se trouvent ces écoles? Brendan enseigne dans le monastère qu'il dirige et qui se trouve à Manticarvan même.²⁷ L'école d'Ilut est plus difficile à situer. Le moine de Dol ne nous dit rien à ce sujet mais Wmonoc la place dans l'île de Pyrus, Demetarius patriae in finibus (l'île de Caldy actuelle).²⁸ Ce qui entre en contradiction avec le fait que Samson, trouvant le monastère d'Ilut trop bruyant, se retire dans celui du saint prêtre Pirus.²⁹ Il est probable qu'Wmonoc a confondu Caldy avec Llanilltud Fawr, où on localise traditionnellement l'école d'Ilut.³⁰

Leur éducation terminée, nos saints prennent leur essor. Nous voyons Samson se retirer à Caldy, en quête de tranquillité. Mais son père malade le fait appeler. En cours de route il traverse une forêt où se situe l'épisode de la *thronochia*.³¹ Il revient ensuite à Caldy pour y trouver l'évêque Dubricius qui le fait élire abbé à la mort de Pirus.³² Cette fois ce sont des moines irlandais retour de Rome qu'il auit dans l'île verte, où il séjourne quelque temps.³³ Rentré à Caldy, il refuse de reprendre la direction du monastère et se retire au désert, iuxta Ahriman Flumen.³⁴ Mais voici que la synode de la province le rappelle. Il est nommé abbé d'un monastère fondé par saint Germain (peut-être Llanilltud Fawr) et sacré évêque.³⁵ Le nuit de Pâques, un ordre céleste lui enjoint de partir. Après une visite aux fondations de sa mère et de sa tante, il arrive, *prospere nauigio*, dans un monastère nommé Decco, sur la côte nord-ouest de la Cornouailles, dans le *pago Tricourius*. Là, le moine Winniau lui demande de répondre la bonne parole dans le voisinage. Sa mission accomplie, Samson passe enfin en Bretagne avec son cousin, le fils d'Adrella,³⁶ c'est-à-dire Magloire, dont le moine de Lehem nous apprend seulement qu'après quelques années passées auprès d'Ilut il mit Samson entre mer.³⁷

Paul voyage également. A seize ans, il se retire au désert, vraisemblablement à Llanddeusant.³⁸ Le roi Marc (Quononorius) l'invite alors auprès de lui, in villa Bannhedon (Caer Bannhed, peut-être Castel Dore en Cornouailles du sud).³⁹ Puis, pour suivre l'appel de l'Evangile, il décide de partir pour la Bretagne. Après une visite à sa sœur Sitofolla à Paul in Penwith, il s'embarque à Mount Bay ou aux îles Scilly et aborde à l'île d'Ossa (Ushant), c'est-à-dire Ouessant, à l'ouest de la Bretagne.⁴⁰

Avec Malo nous rencontrons une autre tradition, celle des grands voyages sur mer, des *faras* irlandais, dont Brendan est l'un des héros. Le jeune Malo s'embarque une première fois à la recherche de l'île d'Ima, réputée pour être un Paradis terrestre.⁴¹ Ce voyage échoue mais Malo, élu évêque, repart un quinzème de l'île merveilleuse. Il aborde sur une terre où il ressuscite un géant païen qui s'offre à le guider et traîne le navire. Mais la tempête l'oblige à faire demi-tour. Le géant meurt dans l'île et c'est pendant le retour en Grande-Bretagne que Malo célèbre la messe sur le dos d'un cétacé.⁴² A peine rentré, il annonce à ses parents son intention de quitter sa patrie et, traversant la Manche, il aborde à l'île du moine Aaron, site du Saint-Malo actuel.⁴³

Un mot pour terminer sur les voyages dans les îles des saints bretons qui n'y sont pas nés, Guénolé et Guénal. Le premier désire vivement s'embarquer pour l'Irlande, nous y reviendrons, mais une apparition de Patrice l'en dissuade.⁴⁴ C'est son successeur, Guénal, qui visite la Grande-Bretagne et l'Irlande. Dans chaque île, il fonde un monastère d'une beauté merveilleuse, celui de Grande-Bretagne l'emportant sur l'autre, et il gagne à la règle de Landévenec et à son patronage cinquante communautés.⁴⁵

Voilà donc, sommairement présentée, la contribution des Vies à la connaissance des saints bretons qui ont passé la première partie de leur existence dans les îles où ils ont séjourné en venant du Continent. Elle n'est pas négligeable. En effet ces Vies, dont une bonne moitié remonte à la seconde partie du IX^e siècle, sont plus anciennes non seulement que les Vies galloises et corniques, mais aussi que la plupart des Vies irlandaises, sans compter les autres documents. Les auteurs connaissent déjà des traditions valables que nous retrouverons plus tard dans les textes insulaires, ils sont souvent les premiers à les rapporter, comme le souligne le chapitre Doble à propos d'Wmonoc.⁴⁶ C'est dire tout l'intérêt d'une étude approfondie de ces sources.

Les rédacteurs écrivent avec une belle assurance. Pourtant ils vivent pour la plupart deux ou trois siècles après le saint célébré et dans une région étrangère aux faits qu'ils rapportent. Données authentiques ou histoire déformée par la légende, peu importe ici. D'où tiennent-ils cette masse d'informations? Tout en faisant la part de leur propre imagination, nous ne pouvons adopter l'attitude hyper-critique qui consiste à dire qu'ils ont inventé de toutes pièces les épiques relatés, pour nombre desquels nous disposons de recoupements inévitables. Il est donc raisonnable de supposer qu'ils ont eu recours à des informateurs ou à des documents d'outre-mer.

Deux de nos auteurs sont explicites à ce sujet. Ainsi le Doléon déclare dès le prologue qu'il a reçu des informations d'un vieux moine grand-breton, qui finissait ses jours au monastère. Ce vieillard était le neveu d'un diacre, Hénoch, cousin de Samson, qui avait interrogé la mère du saint et composé une Vie que le vieux moine avait fait lire devant notre rédacteur.⁴⁷

Plus loin il fait plusieurs fois allusion à des sources orales:

- 1.17: *suum ac laetissimum cum pictura sanctus Samson conlocutionem habuisset audiuimus.*
- 1.37: *quoniam in hac patria per eum Dominus operatus est, unum tamen e pluribus in medium deducamus;*
- 1.42: *in monasterio quod, ut aiunt, a sancto Germano fuerat constructum;*
- 1.45: *ut narrare possem sua patri audiui.*

Il a aussi utilisé des sources écrites:

- 1.38: *referentibus autem mihi de eo littera transmarina supra iam insignita in fenestre monasterii quiescentes... cartam teneo;*
- 1.42: *indiculum dirigit, quod indiculum ego audiui lectum.*

Un dernier passage nous renvoie à ces types de sources:

- 2.8: *ut mihi comperti ac religiosi et, quid est melius, litterarum ipsius loco ultra mare catholice conscripti traderentur.*

De la même façon Wynnoch a recueilli à des informateurs et à des écrits d'outre-mer:

- 7: *Idcirco quaedam habitacula et paruum oratorium quod nunc sub nomine auronum, quorum in hoc opusculo nomina iam praefigere curauimus, fratrum, multis decoratis sedificata dicunt, fabricant;*
- 10: *Via autem ubi per ambrem altius litoris peragravit inter columas praedicatas media incedens, sancti Pauli a transmarinis vocatur;*
- 11: *Presbiterorum verum tantum quos in eiusdem Pauli comitatu eius scripto, sive relatu interfulgentis didicimus in hoc loco uocabulis censimus esse describenda.*

Malgré il y a mieux. Le Doléon déclare être allé sur place, peut-être en mission d'information, et avoir vu quelques-uns des lieux illustrés par Samson:

1.20: *Erat autem non longe ab hoc monasterio insula quaedam nuper fundata a quodam egregio viro ac sancto presbitero Piro nomine, in qua insula et ego fui;*

1.41: *locusque in quo tres fratres supradicti fuerant usque ad tempus quando ego fui in Britannia*

1.48: *uidit ante eum in cuiusdam vertice montis, simulacrum abominabile aduersus; in quo monte et ego fui, signumque crucis quod sanctus Samson sua manu cum quodam ferro in lapide stante sculptis adorari et sua manu palpaui.*

De même Bili fait allusion à la fameuse ronce de Mantequar que de nombreux voyageurs bretons ont pu voir:

1.25: *Quam validissimum multi ex nostris regionibus ad illam patriam euntes uiderunt.*

Nos auteurs ont donc pris soin de s'informer - c'est du moins ce qu'ils affirment - en lisant, en écoutant, en allant sur place. Il ne faut donc pas s'étonner si, en plus des renseignements qu'ils nous transmettent sur leur saint, ils montrent ici et là une certaine connaissance du pays où se passe l'action qu'ils rapportent.

Ainsi la figure de Germain d'Auxerre, maître, supposé d'Iltut, est évoquée par le Doléon et par le moine de Lehon:

Samson 1.7: *Que et ipse Iltutus de disciplina erat sancti Germani, et ipse Germanus ordinauerat eum in suis iuuantibus presbyterum;*

Nagloire 1: *Qui uterque monachiae normae habentes religionis, a quodam egregio Germani Antiochodromensis Ecclesiae praesulis discipulo nomine Heluto, tam artium liberalium quam et dignorum eloquiorum instantissima eruditione fuerat docti.*

On connaît ses voyages en Grande-Bretagne:

Samson 1.42: *in monasterio quod, ut aiunt, a sancto Germano fuerat constructum,*

voyages motivés par l'extension dans l'île du Pélagianisme, comme le rappelle le moine de Lehon, qui en profite pour citer un point de la doctrine des hérétiques:

Nagloire 1: *Qui scilicet praesul Germanus commemorat superius Britannorum nationem ad terebrandum prauum dogmatem haereticorum fallaciam, quae in ea iam adeo pululauerat, olim expedit. Testabantur autem ipsi docentes, liberos ex patribus et matribus baptizatis procreatos, sine baptismi gratia posse saluari, cum Dominus dicit: "Nisi qui renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei." Quo praerogative catholicae fidei errore depresso, ad sedem propriam remouit.*

Dans la Vie de Guénolé, c'est le grand apôtre de l'Irlande, Patrice, qui est évoqué. Après un miracle du jeune Guénolé, le maître Judoc et ses élèves entonnent un hymne en vers diaphanes où il est dit:

1.11: *Discipulus sancti qui comitatus mare Patricii, Christus pro nobis pescare semper habet.*

Comme les codisciples de Guénolé avaient coutume de répéter cet hymne, notre saint fut appelé jusqu'à sa mort *discipulus sancti Patricii*. Plus tard, au cours d'une nuit, il vint à l'esprit de Guénolé l'idée de visiter les lieux où vécut Patrice. C'est l'occasion pour le rédacteur de rappeler ce que représente Patrice pour l'Irlande et le Christienté, lui qui a lutté contre les *magi* et les *arctoi* de l'île. La même nuit, le grand saint apparaît à notre moine pour l'engager à rester en Bretagne (1.19).

Les rédacteurs comprennent la langue des Grands-Bretons. Il leur arrive de traduire en latin un nom de lieu ou un nom d'homme. Ainsi *Wronoc*:

1. provincia quae britannica gentis lingua, eo quod quaedam ipsius pars habetur insula, Penni Oron Latina autem caput dicitur boum,

1: in una eademque regione quae lingua eorum Brethan dincet, latina autem guttur receptaculi pugnas dicitur.

De même l'Anonyme de Dol:

1.46: septuagesimus illorum...lonisum nomine, qui et ipse britannica lingua cum illis lux vocitabatur.⁴⁸

C'est encore *Wronoc* qui signale l'habitude de Grands-Bretons de

former des hypocoristiques en *To-*:

11: Quoniam, quem illi sub additamento more gentis transmarinae *Toquonocum* vocant.⁴⁹

Cette connaissance de *vimur-gallois* ne nous surprend pas. Les Bretons qui visitaient les îles devaient avoir recours et au latin et à la langue du pays. Bien mieux, au IX^e siècle la *vimur-breton* est encore très proche du *vimur-gallois*, la différenciation commencée trois siècles plus tôt n'était pas assez avancée pour gêner la compréhension réciproque. Nous le savons en particulier par un témoignage daté de la seconde moitié du IX^e siècle et consigné dans le *Livre de Llandaf*: quod ipse Guitharth (un prince gallois) et Britones et archiepiscopus illius terrae essent unius linguae et unius nationis quamvis divideretur apertio.⁵⁰ Témoignage qui concorde avec ce que nous dit vers la même époque le moine de Lehon, à propos du départ de Sennen pour la Bretagne: ad grandicandum populo admodum linguae in Occidentis consistenti mare transferebat (1).

Cette dernière constatation nous introduit à une troisième point. Puisqu'en effet la même langue, ou presque, est parlée de chaque côté de la Manche, nous devons nous attendre à ce que d'autres usages

spécifiques se retrouvent chez les habitants des deux rives de cette mer. De fait les Vies nous fournissent à ce sujet un matériel intéressant.

Plongés dans le milieu des religieux, commençons par les coutumes monastiques.

Une des caractéristiques du monachisme celtique est la récitation des *Psalmes* dans des conditions particulièrement dures, rappelant l'ascétisme des *Phères* d'Égypte. Tout d'abord le psautier doit être récité en entier chaque jour, par trois cinquantaines, les *femur tri cœcat* des Irlandais, cités par l'ordo de Kil-Kos, les *regles* de Mael-Ruain, de Comgall et d'Ailbe d'Emlu. Mais ce n'est pas tout. Cette prière était accompagnée de pratiques mortifiantes: *gimulicione*, bras en croix (*crossfigil*), immersion dans l'eau froide.⁵¹ Or nous savons que cet usage avait cours en Bretagne, au moins à Landévenec: Guénolé 2.9: *Quinquagenas namque ter cotidie particulas psalmos consuebat psallere, nunc in crucis modo, nunc immobilis fixus statura, nunc fixis procolutis genibus*. C'est le texte de Clément. Voici ce qu'écrit Wdristen en 2.14: *in psallendo nunc pedibus fixis, nunc genibus flexis, modo manibus expansis*. L'usage de l'immersion nous est donné par la Vie de Guénolé 5:

Singulis noctibus, dum pauserent fratres in frigidissimum flumen, quod conatarium praeterfluebat, clam descendens usque ad scapulas, donec septem penitentialia psalmos pro se cunctisque fidelibus dixisset ibi morabatur.

Le moine irlandais confesse ses fautes à un autre moine en qui il a toute confiance: c'est l'annuaire. L'ami de l'âme.⁵² Cet usage est connu en Bretagne par le premier *Vie de Furiau* 15-16.⁵³ Le saint a pour confesseur Budocan, qu'il considère comme un père plein de science et de sagesse (*quem ut pater habuerat arduum*) et qu'il va trouver quand il sent que l'heure de sa mort approche.

L'utilisation de cloches est aussi un fait caractéristique des pays celtiques. Je passe sur le cloche du monastère pour m'arrêter sur la cloche personnelle du saint. Nous connaissons celles des Irlandais, dont les pouvoirs sont innombrables: ressusciter les morts, guérir les malades, chasser les démons, détruire les sorcières etc..⁵⁴ Paul Aurélien possède une cloche de ce genre. Le roi Marc lui avait refusé la don de cet instrument mais elle traverse la Manche dans le ventre d'un poisson et parvient miraculeusement à Paul:

Haec est autem illa eademque clava quam per cunctos latinorum
populos longi fulvis nomine nota vocatur, cuius per operationem
quoniam eiusdem sancti imperantibus meritis non solum multos
langore fugatos sed etiam in quadam eius tactu rediitum quendam
morbum, eisdem qui viderant attestantibus, audivimus esse
curatum. 55

Il faudrait encore signaler le bâton du saint, qui a les mêmes
pouvoirs que la crosse, le réglementation sévère écartant les femmes
du monastère, attestée pour le second ordre des saints irlandais⁵⁶
et que nous retrouvons en Bretagne avec Bill et le moine de Lehon :
des diacres de Magloire ayant péché avec une courtisane qu'il avait
vue à la porte de l'église, le saint décida d'interdire l'accès de
l'édifice aux femmes.⁵⁷

Signales pour finir que les moines d'Egypte sont honorés en Bretagne et suivis par les Bretons comme des modèles. Ainsi Vie de Crotnef 1.2, où il est question de Basile et de Paphnucce; 2.12: *Valis autem esse unicuique sorum dabatur, ut eis opere manus cotidiano, sicut Aegyptii monachi, se posset in victu cotidiano coniterari.*

De illis

Vie de Paul 6: ad illas tantum dicebat heremitas pertinere qui, consortio mundi derelicto, timore Dei acerbissimam suam afflictione discruciant corpus, exemplo illius exilii patrie Antonii, qui primus suis solitudinis acerbissimam ingreatus habitationem Christicolae docuit, ut aequalis locorum rura per saltus petarent.

Cela concorde avec ce qu'écrit des religieux celtés Nora Chadwick dans son *Age of the Saints*³⁸ et ce que nous lisons dans la Vita David de Rhgyfach au c.31: *sed Egyptios monachos imitatus, similis eis duris vitas*.

Comme on peut s'y attendre, nous avons moins de renseignements sur les usages civils communs aux habitants des deux Bretagne. Nous relevons toutefois deux allusions à la mise en nourriture ou festo-
 59
 erage chez Bili en 1.50:

Post mortem Iudeli surrexit quidam impius et haereticus Bethulus nomine, qui volebat omnes filios principis antedicti interficere, praeter ipsum Maloch, quem ipse a se nutritum volebat laevare in regnum. Sed, cum septem ex his occidere iussisset, unus ex ipsis cum nutritio suo ad cellulam sancti Machuti fugiens late-
bras expetiit.

et dans la Vie de Cuñrold en 1.18:

Puer autem, a quo regestur (equus), Maglus, Consumagli filius,
Fracani nutritoris, appellabatur.

Sur la piste de la culture intellectuelle, je remarque que les Bretons lisent Gide, au moins à Landévennec, et qu'ainsi le saint jouissait d'une grande réputation des deux côtés de la Manche. Le

meine Clément s'inspire ouvertement du De Ercidia dans ce qu'il dit de la Bretagne au chapitre 1, Livre 1 de son ouvrage et il invite le lecteur à lire Gildas s'il veut en savoir plus. Dans le cours de la Vie, Wladatan ajoute quelques emprunts plus modestes, comme ce passage de 2.26: *locum...lucidissimi fontis buillamine...erupto cum leni murmure decurrentibus «aquarum» suavisissimum fœmispost laborem susceduntium soporem amoenissimus, qui rappelle trop ces lignes de Gildas pour ne pas en être en souvenir: DES 3: *fontibus lucidis crebris undis niueas veluti glareas pallentibus pernitidisque rivis leni murmure serpentibus ipsorumque in ripis accubantibus suseis sporis pignus præstendentibus.**

Son disciple Wymonoc est lui aussi un lecteur de Gildas. Il en fait l'éloge au c. 3 de la vie de Paul de perait même connaître une traduction bretonne de *De Excidio*.⁶⁰ Il seppure au rest quelques passages au texte latin. Ainsi au c. 11, ca note qu'il rappelle que aussi l'extraict précédent: *paucos cum muretre ienis auras deauras atque in ripis dormientibus suisis seporis suadibile sonans preterituras.*

Je terminerais par les caractéristiques du latin de nos auteurs.

Il est probable, vu la qualité littéraire de la plupart des Vies antiques, qu'elles ont été largement influencées du point de vue linguistique par le retourisme du latin des écoles favorisé par la réforme des études entreprise à la demande de Charlemagne et que dans leur majorité elles appartiennent à la branche continentale de la latinité carolingienne. Toutefois je relève des traits qui me paraissent rappeler certains aspects du latin insulaire. On rencontre par exemple quelques mots hispaniques : *diaboli* "le diable" comme en particulier sur les glosses d'Emmentach,⁶¹ *theuticus* "Wédien, autre forme du *richionis* des *Nimprici Fines* et du Gildes, maline, "grande marée," dans le *Vie de sapientie*, comme dans le texte

A et dans quelques ouvrages irlandais.
Des callictones également. Ardure, dans la *Vita prima Senecae*
1.30, optimus et arduus vicus, traduit, selon J. Loth, l'irlandais
ard, le gallois arwr, "élevé." L'expression se retrouve chez Bili et
le maître de Gualchal, Budoc, est surnommé Ardure.⁶⁴ Plus intéressant
sans doute est le terme di/cambittio, mot technique qui apparaît
plusieurs fois chez Bili et dans la *Vita secunda Senecae* pour désigner
des terres données en toute propriété et que L. Fleuriot rapproche de
vieux bretons di/cambitt/dicombit.⁶⁵

D'introduction récente sont les mots grecs purement et simplement transcrits en caractères romains. M. Lapidge a montré que cette mode avait été lancée par Jean Scot et qu'après avoir touché quelques Continentaux elle avait connu une grande vogue dans l'Angleterre du Xe siècle.⁶⁶ Je trouve chez Bili *chaucromen*, qui est probablement une transcription de καὶ δὲ οὐκ. ⁶⁷ De même le cleftisme de l'hymne que Clément écrit en l'honneur de Guénolé peut reproduire le grec αὐτὸς dans la prononciation de l'époque byzantine.⁶⁸ A côté je rencontre des formes moins originales, parce qu'elles sont latinisées, mais assez rares, *didaxista*, *didaxantes*, toujours chez Bili, et *optalum* (pour *optalum* = ὀπτάλμω) chez Clément.⁶⁹

Je garde pour la bonne bouche la fameuse hyperbate double E1 E2 S1 S2 et ses variantes, dont j'ai déjà eu l'occasion de dire qu'elles étaient une des caractéristiques saillantes de la prose latine celtique.⁷⁰ Aux listes que j'ai publiées dans mon article des *Etudes Celtiques* et qui, j'en conviens volontiers, doivent être allégées de quelques exemples mal venus, j'ajouterais pour l'ordre E1 E2 S1 S2 trois exemples de la *Vie de Paul*:

- 1: *flammeo sancti inspiratus amore* flatus
- 2: *duarum dubus...mandatorum amixus alis*
- 3: *artissima suam afflictione discruciant corpus.*

Certains auteurs paraissent même avoir poussé le raffinement jusqu'à augmenter le nombre des éléments de la construction. Ainsi dans la *Vie de Guénolé* on peut voir un ensemble E1 E2 E3 S1 S2 S3 dans *secras huius firma historie praeclit sancti gestorum radice*,⁷¹ si l'on rapporte *huius* à *sancti*.

Wremonc pour sa part s'amuse à combiner deux séries d'hyperbates de la façon suivante: E1 E2 et e2 S1 S2 et e2 dans *universas osteris ac novae cum suis ab eodem ediscens bibliotheca legio expositionibus praecceptorum* (2).

M. Winterbottom a fait remarquer que l'ordre E1 E2 S1 S2 apparaissait dans la prose latine dès la *Rhétorique* à *Serennius* et il a relevé à travers la latinité des exemples qu je ne connaissais pas.⁷² C'est un fait. Mais la fréquence des occurrences doit être, à mon avis, prise en compte et j'estime que les auteurs latino-celtiques sont particulièrement friands de cette hyperbate.

Je viens de dire que la plupart des Vies anciennes se situent dans le fil de la tradition continentale carolingienne. Encore faut-il noter que la disjonction simple, du type *sanctorum scintilla litterarum*, est très fréquente dans ces Vies, bien plus que dans les

ouvrages continentaux de la même époque. C'était déjà un tic chez Sidoine et Ennodius, on la retrouve ensuite dans les Iles, en particulier chez Adomnán. Mais, si j'ai dit "la plupart des Vies," c'est parce qu'il faut réserver une place spéciale à l'œuvre d'Wremonc. Ce n'est pas un hasard si la double hyperbate est particulièrement fréquente dans la *Vie de Paul*, ou si l'on y trouve une combinaison d'hyperbates doubles comme celle que j'ai citée. Le moine de Landévennec s'entend à construire, surtout dans les premières pages de son ouvrage, des phrases qui obligent le lecteur à un véritable jeu de puzzle. On rencontre encore chez lui, au détour d'une proposition, un groupe de mots aussi réduit que *orationis in Dei confusus cito surrexit oratorio* (4) qui révèle une construction en balancier *orationis in Dei confusus...adulatorio*, construction très dérivée, à l'opposé de la syntaxe linéaire et toute romane que l'on remarque dans la *Vie de Turiau*, par exemple: *Turiau domus, Dominus misit me ad te et, propter tuum amorem et deprecationem, iussit me redire in hoc seculo* (5). Or ce goût pour l'entrelac n'apparaît-il pas déjà chez Gildas ou dans le périod qui ouvre l'*Épître* à *Alfred* et plus tard dans le poème acrostiche de Dunstan, pour citer un poète anglais du Xe siècle?⁷³

On me dira que ce style n'est pas propre aux Iles, qu'il en existe des échantillons sous d'autres cieux. Certes, mais la encore la concentration est telle que j'y verrais volontiers la marque d'une recherche entretenu au cours des siècles dans une zone bien déterminée.

Les Vies nous montrent donc que les Bretons partageaient avec les Insulaires un certain nombre d'usages. Cette communauté s'explique bien par les relations étroites qui liaient les deux rives de la Manche et les populations qui les habitaient. C'est dans la *Vie de Guénolé* 1.19 que nous voyons des marchands attendre dans un port breton le vent favorable qui les poussera vers les Iles: *cum avaranti-bus transmarina negotia asportantibus ventum in portu cerant* *expectantibus simul perarant et transigrarent ad Scotos*. Dans la *Vie de Turiau* au c. 9 nous lisons que le saint a un ami outre mer, du nom de Gerent (*amicus eius, Gerent nomine, quem habebat trans mare*). Cet ami meurt. Turiau en est averti par une vision. Il envoie un héraut et des gens pour s'en informer et ceux-ci rencontrent à mi-route des messagers qui venaient apporter la nouvelle. Les nombreuses occurrences de *ultra mare*, *trans mare*, *ultra mare* précisent encore l'existence de ces relations.

Il n'est pas sans intérêt de découvrir dans des documents qui s'étendent grosso modo des années 850 aux années 1000 combien les îles et leur civilisation, quatre ou cinq siècles après l'émigration, étaient présentes dans la vie des Bretons continentaux.

Négligée en France, pour ne pas dire méprisée, la Bretagne a été, sauf exceptions, sous-estimée de l'autre côté du Channel.⁷⁴ Dans les études celtiques, la part des Bretons a souvent été celle du parent pauvre. Il n'y a guère encore, les plus grands celtisants, et les Français comme les autres, ne leur consacraient qu'une partie de leurs travaux.

Et pourtant, pendant tout le Moyen Âge, avant que les nationalismes naissants ne le transforment en un fossé ou un champ clos, la mer était une route, un trait d'union entre des peuples qui se reconnaissaient comme frères et qui se se-vaient appartenir à une même communauté d'origine.

Sur la civilisation celtique nous avons donc à apprendre aussi Bretons continentaux. On a remarqué qu'il y avait parfois les premiers à rapporter une tradition bien connue dans le Mass, je l'ai signalé plus haut à propos de la Vie de Paul. N'en est-il pas de même avec la vie de Guénolé, Albi Trimmus, Owen Teirbron, dont nous parle le moine Clément?⁷⁵ Rendre aux Bretons la part qui leur revient dans le concert des peuples celtiques, tel est aujourd'hui l'effort de savants comme L. Fleuriot.

On sure remarqué que dans ces Vies la Grande-Bretagne tient en volume une place plus importante que l'Irlande. La géographie et l'histoire l'imposaient. C'est peut-être cette intimité que explique que le monastère fondé par Guénolé en Grande-Bretagne est, selon son biographe, plus remarquable que celui qu'il a construit dans l'île voisine. Mais d'un autre côté ce sont des *suetti peritissimi* que *Sannos* ont en Irlande, et non d'autres Bretons. N'oublions pas non plus l'attrait qu'a exercé sur Guénolé, ou sur Wriston, la personnalité de Patrick.

L'attachement à la culture des pays celtiques est donc encore très fort chez les moines de la Bretagne carolingienne. Pourtant depuis le début du IX^e siècle les souverains francs s'efforcent de faire pénétrer leur influence dans la péninsule. En 818 Louis le

Pieux, au cours d'une expédition en Bretagne, impose à Landévenec la règle bénédictine. Quand Redon est fondé en 832, le roi s'intéresse à ses débuts et la même règle y est introduite par un bénédictin de Claufeuil. Sans aucun doute la réforme carolingienne a touché les écoles bretonnes: un texte comme la Vie de Magloire le montre. Il serait intéressant de savoir ce que donnera la suite et de voir jouer dans les écrits postérieurs les influences celtique et continentale.

NOTES

¹ L'ouvrage de référence sur les Vies bretonnes est le "Mémento des sources hagiographiques de l'histoire de Bretagne" de F. Duine, *Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société d'archéologie du département d'Ille-et-Vilaine* 46 (1918): 343-457. J'ai retenu dans ma collection, à partir des chapitres 1 et 2 du Mémento, quatorze textes, en fonction de lieu d'activité du saint et de la datation de la Vie proposée par Duine: Comouyon (Duine n°5), Guénaél (n°6), Guénolé (n°7), Magloire (n°10), Malo (Vie anonyme et Vie par Bili: n°11), Melain (n°13), Paul Aurélien (n°14), Samson (Vita prima et Vita secunda: n°2), Tudual (Vita prima: n°15), Turtiau (Vita prima et Vita secunda: n°16), *Gesta sanctorum Aconensium* (n°5). Sont aussi écartées les Vies postérieures contenant des éléments plus anciens, comme par exemple les Vies de Briec et de Gildas.

² *Saint Paulinus of Wales*, Guildford and Zahar, 1942. Repris dans le recueil *Lives of the Welsh Saints*, édité par D. Simon (Evans, Cardiff, 1971), pp. 146-61.

³ "Les hagiographes bretons et la Renaissance carolingienne," *Bulletin philologique et historique* (1966), pp. 651-59.

⁴ Le chapitre 7, "Brittany," pp. 160-190 de la 2^{ème} éd., Cardiff, 1977.

⁵ *Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest* 81 (1974): 25-42.

⁶ *Francis* 3 (1977): 1-26.

⁷ Je précise qu'ici la valeur historique des Vies ne me concerne pas. Ce qui compte, c'est ce que rapportent les auteurs, qu'il s'agisse de faits réels, de légendes ou de faus.

⁸ Ed. C. De Smet, AN 7 (1888): 172-249. Sur la composition de la Vie, voir H. Lecoche, *Mélanges d'histoire de Cornouaille (Ve-XVe siècle)* (Paris, 1911), pp. 9-24.

⁹ Ed. C. Guisard, RC 5 (1883): 417-56.

¹⁰ Ed. F. Lot, *Annales de Bretagne* 24 (1908-1909): 244-62, 382-405, 575-98; 25 (1909-1910): 47-73.

¹¹ La Vie proprement dite est éditée par les Bollandistes *Acta Sanctorum*, oct., X p. 782-91 et les Mireux, par A. de la Borderie (*Miscelanea de S. Magloire et fondation du monastère de Lehon*, [Rennes, 1891]).

¹² Ed. A. de la Borderie, *Mémoires de la Société d'Archéologie des Côtes-du-Nord*, 2^{ème} série, 2.84 ff.

¹³ Ed. R. Fautier, *La Vie de Saint Samson. Essai de critique hagiographique* (Paris, 1912). Pour la datation, voir Poulin, pp. 4-5.

¹⁴ Ed. F. Flaine, AN 6 (1887): 79-80 et 82-150.

¹⁵ Ed. Bollandistes, *Ad Sanctorum*, nov., I, p. 674-679.

¹⁶ Ed. F. Lot, *Annales de Bretagne* 23 (1907-1908): 560-79; 24 (1908-1909): 90-106.

¹⁷ Vita prima 1.1; Vita secunda 1.1. La Vita secunda précise qu'Anna est originaire de Venetia patris (Orent, selon l'éditeur).

¹⁸ Vie 1.

¹⁹ Vie anonyme 1 et 14; Vie par Bili 1.1.

²⁰ Vie 1.

²¹ Double, pp. 146-56.

²² Vie 1.

²³ Vita secunda (éd. La Borderie, cf. n. 12) 1.

²⁴ Vie 1.2.

²⁵ Vie de Paul 2 et 3; Vita prima Samsonis 1.7; Vita secunda Samsonis 1.4; Vie de Magloire 1.

²⁶ Vie anonyme 1; Vie par Bili 1.2 et 3.

²⁷ Vie anonyme 1; Vie par Bili 1.1.

²⁸ Vie 2.

²⁹ Vita prima 1.20; Vita secunda 1.8.

³⁰ Double, p. 99.

³¹ Vita prima 1.23-28; Vita secunda 1.9.

³² Vita prima 1.33-36; Vita secunda 1.10.

³³ Vita prima 1.37-39; Vita secunda 1.11-12.

³⁴ Vita prima 1.39-41; Vita secunda 1.13.

³⁵ Vita prima 42-44; Vita secunda 1.13-14.

³⁶ Vita prima 1.45-52; Vita secunda 1.15-17 et 2.8.

³⁷ Vie 3.

- ³⁵Vie 7; Dobie, pp. 150-52.
- ³⁸Vie 8, Dobie, pp. 154-57.
- ⁴⁰Vie 9-10; Dobie, pp. 158-61.
- ⁴¹Vie anonyme 7.
- ⁴²Vie anonyme 9-14; Vie par Bili 1.15-24.
- ⁴³Vie anonyme 14-15; Vie par Bili 1.26-28.
- ⁴⁴Vie 1.19.
- ⁴⁵Vie 2. 9-11.
- ⁴⁶Dobie, p. 147.
- ⁴⁷Vite prima, 1er prologue, 2.
- ⁴⁸Les MSS *R R X* donnent une leçon *Uiniaus*/ - *x* qui correspond mieux à la traduction lux. si *Uiniaus* est à rapprocher de *Uinniau(n)* que L. Fleuriot, dans son Dictionnaire des glosses en vieux breton (Paris, 1964), s.v., interprète comme dérivé de *uain(n)*, "blanc, heureux" (voir aussi sous *guinn*, "blanc, lumineux").
- ⁴⁹Le vieux-breton a également cette formation: L. Fleuriot, *Le vieux breton, éléments d'une grammaire*, (Paris, 1964), pp. 403-5.
- ⁵⁰Fleuriot, Dictionnaire, p. 13.
- ⁵¹L. Cougnaud, *Les chrétiens celtiques* (Paris, 1911), pp. 97-100 et 310; O. Leyer, *Les chrétiens celtiques*, (Paris, 1965), pp. 40-41.
- ⁵²Cougnaud, p. 278. On a en latin *unicus animus* dans la *Vita Nectod* 20 (V), la *Vita Nectod* 38 (H1) et la *Vita Barri* 14, en face de *peter confessoris*, V. *Nectod* 20(H), *Vita Nollus* 38, *Vita Barri* 14 et *confessor*, *Vita Nectod* 20 (H R 1), *Vita Barri* 14.
- ⁵³M. F. Duins, *Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société archéologique du département d'Ile-et-Vilaine* 41.2 (1912): 29-47.
- ⁵⁴C. Plummer, *Vitae Registorum Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1910) 1: cluxvi, ff.
- ⁵⁵Vie 9 et 17.
- ⁵⁶C. Plummer, p. cxxi et n. 4.
- ⁵⁷Vie par Bili 1.31: non enim a conspectu malitiae uolens se separare; Miracles de Magloire 4. (10).
- ⁵⁸P. 35, ff.
- ⁵⁹Sur le *fontarag* dans les Vies, voir non "Essai sur la mise en nourriture et l'éducation dans les pays celtiques d'après le

- témoignage des textes hagiographiques latins," *EC* 12, (1968-9): 101-46 (pour les deux passages concernés, pp. 126-7).
- ⁶⁰Vie 3: sanctus Gylidan cuius sagacitatem ingenii...liber ille... quem Ormestus Britanniae vocant declarat. Voir la note de N. Gaidem, *EC* 5. 459-60 et L. Fleuriot, Dictionnaire, s.v. *ormest*. *Ormesta Britanniae* peut être le titre breton latinisé du *De Excidio* ou celui de sa version bretonne.
- ⁶¹Vie par Bili 1.23; H. F., C 47 *duinus*; *diabolus*; *Adalphus Adalga* 23.
- ⁶²Vie de Guénolé 2.4. H. F. A107, 390, 481, 563; B144, D114; *DES* 19.
- ⁶³Vie de Magloire 31. H. F. A400. Sur ce mot, voir N. Hartman, *The Hesperica Famina* 1 (Toronto, 1974): 180.
- ⁶⁴Vie par Bili 1.66; Vie de Guénolé 1.4. Voir J. Loth, *EC* 39 (1922): 310, n. 2.
- ⁶⁵Vie par Bili 1.43, 44 etc.; *Vita secunda Samonis* 2.18.19, etc. Voir L. Fleuriot, Dictionnaire, s.v. *dicomit*.
- ⁶⁶N. Lapidge, "L'influence stylistique de la poésie de Jean Soot," dans *Jean Soot Erigène et l'histoire de la philosophie*, (Colloque de Leon, 1975 [Paris, 1977]), pp. 441-52.
- ⁶⁷Vie par Bili *Vimus sancti Meschuti* 23. Cf. *Adalphus Adalga* 7: *celeronen* (gloss *ropemus*); dans B: *caluronnen* (gloss *uonunus*).
- ⁶⁸Rymus (*Ed. de Smad*, loc. cit., p. 263-4), v. 75.
- ⁶⁹Vie par Bili 1.26 et 30; Rymus, v.71.
- ⁷⁰"Un mode stylistique dans la prose latine des pays celtiques," *EC* 13 (1972): 275-97.
- ⁷¹Dans la notice rédigée par Wristan avant 1.1.
- ⁷²"A Celtic Hyperborean?", *BSCS* 27 (1977): 207-12.
- ⁷³Donné par N. Lapidge dans "The Hibernian Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature," *AGS* 4 (1975): 108-111.
- ⁷⁴Voir Fleuriot, Dictionnaire, p. 33, n. 1: "L'importance de la Bretagne continentale dans le monde celtique du haut Moyen-Âge paraît parfois sous-estimée."
- ⁷⁵Vie de Guénolé 1.2.

- Albi. Bibliothèque Rochegude, MS 79: 110 n60
- Alençon. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 14 (Codex Alençonensis): 132 nn79, 80
- Amiens. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 426 15
- Antwerp. Plantin-Moretus Museum, MS 47: 81 n141
- Bamberg. Bibliothek, MS B.II.10: 53, 54
- Berlin. Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Phillippe 121 (Codex Berlinensis): 132 n79
- Bern. Burgerbibliothek, MS 337: 77 n107
MS 363 43 n39
- Boulogne-sur-Mer. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 74(82): 51, 71 n54
- Brussels. Bibliothèque Royale, MS 1828-30: 81 n141
- Cambridge. Corpus Christi College, MS 9: 70 n48, 160
MS 173: 168, 169, 177 n70
MS 183: 132 nn73, 75, 176 n61
MS 285. 132 n71
MS 326: 132 n72
MS 356, pt. 3: 81 n141
- Fembroke College, MS 120: 174 n30
- Trinity College, MS R.15.32: 79 n127
- University Library, MS Ms. 2.4: 160
MS Gg. 5.35: 57, 58, 160
MS II. 3.12: 173 n16
- Cologne. Dombibliothek, MS 83^{II}: 108 n41
- St. Gallen. Stiftsbibliothek, MS 318: 193 n69
- Escorial, St. Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, MS B.iv.17: 74 n78
- Exeter. Cathedral Library, MS 3507: 98, 100, 101, 110 nn37, 58
- Hereford. Cathedral Library, MS P. 1. 17: 132 n72
- Laon. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 298: 44 n55
MS 468: 27, 31, 32, 37, 38
- Leiden. Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Scaligeranus 69: 58
- Lincoln. Cathedral Library, MS 182. 174 n34
- London. British Library, Additional MS 32246: 81 n141
MS 38132: 82 n153
MS 47967: 168, 177 n70
MS Cotton Augustus II.18: 50
MS Cotton Caligula A.xv: 108 n21
MS Cotton Domitian I: 103, 110 n57
MS Cotton Galba A.xviii: 48
MS Cotton Julius A.vi: 122
MS Cotton Nero A.i: 172 n10
MS Cotton Nero E.i, vol. 1: 61, 70 n48
MS Cotton Nero E.i, vol. 2: 70 n48
MS Cotton Ocho B.xi: 168
MS Cotton Tiberius A.vi: 175 n44
MS Cotton Tiberius A.xv: 58
MS Cotton Tiberius C.11: 80 n16
MS Cotton Tiberius D.iv, vol. 2: 78 n120
MS Cotton Vespasian D.xii: 122
MS Cotton Vitalianus A.xii: 164 n5, 110 nn57, 58
MS Cotton Vitellius A.xii: 99, 100
MS Cotton Vitellius A.xix: 132 nn73, 74, 75
MS Harley 1117: 132 nn71, 75
MS Harley 2506: 80 n139
MS Harley 3013: 132 n72
MS Harley 3826: 81 n148
MS Royal 18.xv: 48
MS Royal 28.xi: 132 n72
MS Royal 68.vi: 132 n78

- MS Royal 68 vii 132 n72
MS Royal. 70 11 81 n141
MS Royal 70 xxiiv 132 n72
MS Royal 120. xvi 168-169
MS Royal. 15A. xvi 81 n141
Lambeth Palace, MS 362 174 n30
Source: Bibliothèque Capitulaire.
MS 124 105 n13
Milan. Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS N 150 inf 107 n29.
106 n37, 41
MS L 22 sup 15
MS N 79 sup. 47
Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 396 96, 109 n45
Clm 4605 132 n79
Clm 6407: 179, 181, 193, 106
Clm 18954 132 n79
Clm 18961: 179, 181, 182, 183, 186
Orléans. Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 184(181): 58
Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Auct. P. 2.30: 110 n57
MS Auct. P. 3.14: 110 n57
MS Barlow 35. 81 n141
MS Bodley 49(1946): 132 n72
MS Bodley 97(1928): 132 n72
MS Bodley 109(1962): 132 n71, 75
MS Bodley 537(27845). 132 n71
MS Digby 61: 75 n90, 106 n21, 109 n48, 168
MS Digby 112: 61, 81 n147, 148, 149
MS Digby 146(19747): 132 n72
MS Digby 163: 81 n142
MS Digby 175(1776): 132 n73, 75
Ms Fell 1: 70 n48
Ms Fell 3: 70 n48
Ms Fell 4: 70 n48
MS Hatton 20: 177 n70
MS Junius 27: 169
MS Rawlinson C 697: 132 n71
MS Top. gen. c.1-4: 82 n153
St. John's College, MS 17: 40, 61, 79 n127
MS 178: 110 n57
Paris. Bibliothèque de la Mazarine, MS 561: 29
Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Lat. 1711: 105 n15
MS Lat. 2779: 193 n69
MS Lat. 3088: 20, 31
MS Lat. 5095: 43 n42
MS Lat 5294 a. 7 n4
MS Lat 5299 "a n12", 63 n119
MS Lat 10864 Codex Parisiensis a. 8 11. n4
MS Lat 12949 29
MS Lat 13953 179, 180, 181, 182-183, 186
MS Lat 16340 193 n69
Reims. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 118 10
Rouen. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1 49 ICat. 5241. 108 n41
St. Gall. Stiftsbibliothek, MS 248 108 n41
MS 565 (Codex Sangallensis) 132 n79, 80
MS 846 193 n69
St. Paulin-Earoten. Stiftsbibliothek, MS 25.2.16. 96
Salisbury. Cathedral Library, MS 38 132 n72
Schaffhausen. Stadtbibliothek, MS Generalia I: 5
Stuttgart. Landesbibliothek, MS MS VII 48: 192 n51
MS MS XIV 1: 132 n79, 80
Tours. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 334. 107 n29
Trier. Stadtbibliothek, MS 1834 (Codex Treverensis): 132 n79
Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 201. 193 n69
MS Reg. lat. 1260: 57, 77 n107
MS Reg. lat. 1671: 159
MS Reg. lat. 1709: 179, 181
MS Vat. lat. 3363: 159
MS Vat. lat. 6018: 110 n60
MS Vat. lat. 7207: 190 n23, 192 n50
Vienna. Nationalbibliothek, MS 751: 49
Weingarten. MS 1630: 132 n79
Wiesbaden. Universitätsbibliothek, MS N.p.th. f. 34 (Codex Wirzburgensis): 132 n79, 80
MS N.p.th. f. 56: 179, 181
MS N.p.th. f. 61: 108 n31

GENERAL INDEX

Anonymous works are listed by title.

- Aachen, 137, 144
Aaron, monk, 199
Abbo, St., Abbot of Fleury, 57, 58, 59-60, 61, 62, 80 n39, 83, 99, 103 n2, 106 n22; Passio S. Eadmundi, 59, 79 n125; Quaestiones Grammaticales, 60
Abingdon, 162, 164, 175 n44
Acta Synodi Casarensis, 88-90, 92
Adamnan, St., 7, 103 n2, 207;
De Locis Sanctis, 2, 6;
Vita Columbae, 3, 5, 9
Adelfius de civitate Colonia Londinensi (Caeson on Usk?), 87
Adomnan. See Adamnan, St.
Adriaen, Marcus, 2
Aelfric, 59, 78 n118, 79 n125; Lives of Saints, 79 n125, 126
Aethelred, 79 n109
Aethelred, King, 163
Aethelstan, King, 163, 167
Aethelwold of Winchester, St., 78 n120, 159, 164; Benedictional, 59; Angulus Consecratus, 59, 78 n118
Aethica Insuper Officia, 14
Aethicus Ister, 6, 14, 81
Cosmographie, 37-38, 186
Aethilwulf, De Abbatibus, 84
Africa, 197, 198
Augustine. See Augustine, St., Sp. of Hippo
Aidan, 103 n2
Ailpe d'Emly, 203
Alba Trinaurus, 197, 208
Albertus Magnus, 193
Aloisius, 6, 25, 38, 46, 83-84, 85, 73 n76, 75 n89, 114, 116, 120, 121, 123, 123, 126, 127 n4, 128-140, 132 n87, 137, 179, 180, 181, 184, 185, 188, 187, 189 n21, 190 n23; De Decretis, 39; De Communione, 181-143, 145; De Trinitate, 186; Debatibus between Winter and Spring, 186; Dialogus de Rhetorica et Verborum, 39, 135, 140; "Wiley for a Nightingale," 136; Aristola de Pteris Colandis, 24; "Epitaph," 136; "Parvelli to his Cell," 136, 148, 152 n47; Libri Carolini, 73 n76; poem on Lindisfarne, 136; poem on York, 53, 54, 75 n87, 136, 159; Vita Sancti Iudoci, 53; Vita Sancti Willibrodii, 113, 117, 118, 123, 127 n4, 136
Adelmus, 43-42
Aldfrith of Northumbria, 167
Aldhelm, St., 7-8, 12, 46, 47, 48-50, 51, 52, 53, 62, 68 n30, 70 n42, 96-98, 100, 109 n48, 110 n58, 114, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 125; German de Virginitate, 118, 119, 121, 123, 129 n27; Olaus Aidelm de Curia Luce par Signa n1; Germanus Gratia, 48, 86, 99; De Meritis, 72 n41; De Poem Magna, 68 n32, 72 n41; De Virginitate, 50, 113, 115-116, 119, 123; Epigramma, 70 n42; Epistola IX, 48 n34; Epistola ad Eucherium, 72; Letter to Gerbert, 109 n48; Prosa de Virginitate, 118, 119, 120-121, 123
Aldis, Abbot of York, 75 n80
Alexander, Jonathan, 123
Alexandria, 84, 86, 88
Alfred, King of Wessex, 54, 86, 167, 168, 170
Almuo of Auxillium, 28
Amarius of Metz, Liber Officiorum, 78 n35
Anacrusis, St., 88, 188 n36, 189, 181, 184, 185, 188, 187, 189 n21, 190 n23; De Decretis, 39; De Communione,

- Amos, 197
Anacletus, Pope, 199 n24
Anastolius, St., Sp. of Leodiceae,
88, 95, 97
Anderson, Alan Orr, 3
Anderson, Marjorie Ogilvy, 3
Angilbert, 147
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 169
Anna, 197
Anselm of Canterbury, 15
Anonymus ad Cuthbertum, 14, 38
Anzor, 51, 53, 62, 119
Aretius, 101
Aristotle, 34, 36
Arlas, Synod of (AD 344), 86-
87, 89, 111 n61
Arminius Diaconus, 87
Asper, 103 n2
Asser, 45, 159, 170
Athalstan Psalter, 48
Atlantis, 34
Augustine of Hippo, 113
Augustine, Hieronymus, 95
Augustine, St., Abp. of Canter-
bury, 47
Augustine, St., Ap. of Hippo,
86, 89, 92, 109 n51a, 119,
179, 181-188, 187; *Confes-
siones*, 122; *Contra Epistolam
Faventinorum*, 105 n15; *De Di-
versis Questionibus*, 181; *De
Doctrina Christiana*, 123; *De
Genesi ad Litteram*, 92; *De
Trinitate*, 181; *Epistola ad
Jovinianum*, 92
Aurelianus, St. n'Bois, 13
Aurelius, 86, 99
Aulus, St., 118
"B.", 77 n11; *Vita S. Dun-
stani*, 58
Baker, Peter, 60, 61
Bald's Leechbook, 169
Balthasar, 54
Bamper, 11, 89, 92
Barnet, J., 3
Barlow, Frank, 170
Basil, St., the Great, 204
Bath Abbey, 51
Battle, 174 n27
Beacon, 85
Beda Venerabilis, 6, 9, 45, 46,
47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 62,
66 n1, 72 n66, 75 n80, 83, 88,
90, 96, 99, 100, 103 n2, 118
n88, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121,
122, 126; *De Die Iudicii*, 62,
86 n127; *De Historia Britum*, 60,
61 n139, 157; *Enchiridion*, 60,
61, 80 n139; *Historia Regum*,
61, 80 n136, 137, see also
Symeon of Durham; *Vita S. Ege-
dii*, 61, 80 n137, *Vita S. Os-
waldi*, 61, 80 n139
Caecilian, Sp. of Carthage, 86
Caer Bannhad, 199
Caesar, Gaius, 90
Caesarea, 89
Caldeus, Caldeans, 34
Caldy, Isle de, 198
"Cambridge Songs," 160
Campbell, Alistair, 46, 67 n18,
169
Campus Albus, Synod of (AD 631),
84
Campus Lenis, Ireland. See Nagh
Léna
Candidus, 181, 183, 184, 185;
see also Candidus-Wiso
Candidus-Wiso of Fulda, 180, 186
Candidus-Wiso, 180, 185, 186-187,
188 n1, 192 n55, 193 n57; *Mun-
Christus Corporis Crucis Desu
Videre Potuerit*, 186, 187;
Opusculum de Passione Domini,
186, 187
Caponas Hibernenses, 15
Canterbury, 47, 48, 49, 58, 91,
98, 166; see also Christ
Church, Canterbury; St. Augus-
tine's, Canterbury
Carmen ad Flavianum Felicem de Re-
surrectione Northorum, 51
Carthage, 89
Carvanna, 197
Cassiodorus, 103 n3, 109 n51a;
De Anima, 192 n57
Castel Dore. See Caer Bannhad
Catonius, King, 197
Cellanus, Abbot of Ferrona Spot-
torum, 12
Cenulwulf, 167
Chadwick, Hore, 204
Chalcidius, 179
Chaplain, Pierre, 47, 50
Charlemagne, 34, 135, 144, 145,
305
Charles the Bald, 31
Cham, Colin, 63, 154
Chester-le-Street, 167
Christ Church, Canterbury, 58,
62, 162, 173
Chrysostom, John, St., 47
Cicero, 55
Cigemar, Einjola, 63

- Claudian, 69 n30
Claudianus Mamertus, 182, 183,
185, 186, 187, 192 n57, 193
n69; *De Statu Animae*, 187,
193 n69
Clément, monk, 186, 203, 205,
206
Clément of Alexandria, 47
Clonfert, 104 n6
Clonfert-Mullos, Co. Lenois, 85
Clonmacnoise, Co. Offaly, 85
Coccolia, Edmondo, 9-10, 12-13,
16
Colgraves, Bertzen, 46, 66 n1,
114, 117
Columba the Younger. See Colum-
banus, St.
Columbanus, Abbot of St. Trond,
12; *Planctus*, 12
Columbanus, St., 6, 7, 8, 9, 11,
12, 88, 92, 93; *Ad Hilarium*,
12; *Ad Hilarium*, 12; *Ad
Sethum*, 12; *Opera*, 2
Connell, St., 203
Compiègne, 29
Compiègne Cathaginensis, 88, 89
Contagionibus Verborum, 51
Constantine, Emperor, 86
Constantinople, 63
Contreni, John, 10, 57
Cordis, 57
Corippus, 50
Cornwallis, 158, 199
Crediton, 98
Cripplegate Hospital, London,
174 n27
Cuthbertus, 14, 38
Damasius Peta (Cuthbertus or Co-
lmanus or Columanus Locus),
Abbot of Clonfert, 104 n6;
Celebra Iuda, 154 n6
Damian, 84-86, 99, 101, 102,
105 n15, 107 n38, 111 n87;
Epistola, 85
Curtius, Ernst Robert, 114, 197
Cyprian, *Tractatus de Passione
Paschoe*, 50
Cyril, Sp. of Alexandria (AD
436-444), 91; *Epistola de
Passione (Epistola Cyrilliana)*,
91, 94
Damasius, 118
De Decem Cratibus Augustini,
180, 181, 183
*De Dignitate Conditionis Cam-
panae*, 180
De Schola Antistitii, 88 n138

- Jackson, Kenneth, 17 n13
 Jarrov, 99
 Jeuneau, Edouard, 3, 29, 43 n42
 Jerome, St., 11, 12, 13, 14, 31,
 75 n90, 92, 93, 119, *Epistola*
 8, 36; *Epistola* 53, 38; *In*
Basile Parnasia Adversarius, 2;
 translation of *Chronicle* of
 Eusebius of Caesarea, 93
 Jerusalem, 89
 John, James, 155
 Jones, Charles W., 46, 52, 89
 Joat, Karl, 172 n10
 Julian of Toledo, 47, 68 n24;
Epistola ad Adrianum Abbatem,
 68 n24
 Junius Peitler, 169
 Juvenal, 89 n30
 Juvenius, 53, 119, 124

 Keats, John, "Ode to a Nightin-
 gale," 138
 Kelly, Joseph, 2
 Kernels of Wincombe, St., 61
 Kenney, James Francis, 16
 Ker, Neil, 153, 160, 161, 162
 Karlougan, François, 8, 7, 49
 Keynes, Elton, 163
 Kition, Peter, 48
 Kjelby-Siddie, B., 59
 Kloppech, Paul, 114, 124
 Kösken, Ewald, 54

 Laizén, Abbot of Leighenne,
 84, 102
 Leistner, M.L.W., 45, 50, 53
 Lendevenc, 196, 197, 203, 204,
 209
 Lantfred, 37, 78 n117; *Transla-
 tio de Miracula S. Swithuni*,
 59
 Lanthony, 174 n27
 Leon, 23, 37
 Lepique, Michael, 6, 12-13,
 157, 168, 206
 Leryillière, René, 195
 Lethom, *Sologas Novitium Ove-
 gori in Job*, 2
 Leventium, Sp. of Cantabury,
 91
 Lew, Vivian, 20 n70, 51, 71 n50
 Leveson, monk of, 196, 198, 201,
 202, 204
 Leiden, Sp. of Lyons, 184
 Leiland, John, 63-64; *Collectanea*
de Rebus Britanicis, 64, 62
 n153, 154
 Leo, Sp. of Roma (AD 444-461),

- 87
 Leo, monk, 108 n36
 Leofath, 77 n108
 Leofric, Sp. of Crediton, 166
 Leuthere, 49
 Levison, Wilhelm, 46
 Lewes, 174 n27
 Liber Monasterian, 49, 69 n30,
 70 n62
Liber Carolini, 145, 146, 147,
 152, 180, 181, 184, 189 n31,
 190 n23; see also Theodulf,
 Sp. of Orleans
 Liège, 170
 Lindisfarne, 54
 Lindsay, Wallace Martin, 45, 66
 n13, 4
 Llancarfan. See Manticarvan
 Llanddeusan, 199
 Llanilltud Fawr, 198
 Lobineau, Dom, 193
 Löfstedt, Bengt, 2, 3, 4, 15, 72
 n59
 Louis I (the Pious), King, 208-
 209
 Louis IV, King, 146
 Lowe, Elias Avery, 45, 50, 154
 Löwe, Heinz, 14, 180, 181
 Lot, Ferdinand, 195
 Lucan, 101; *Orpheus*, 48, 49, 69
 n30
 Lui, 49
 Lupus, Servatus, Abbot of Ferri-
 ères, 28, 31, 75 n90

- Macedonius, 120
 McGinty, Dom, 15
 McHally, Robert E., 2, 8, 9
 McManus, Martin, 9, 15
 MacNeill, Boia, 6
 Mesochius, *In Somnium Scipionis*,
 62, 88 n139
 Metzer, Goulven, 3
 Méli-Ruain, 203
 Michahin, 96
 Meg Léna, 85
 Meg Léna, *Synod of (AD 630)*, 83,
 85
 Meglouis, St., 196, 197, 198,
 204
 Maine, 49
 Mallesbury, 50, 96, 97, 100
 Malo, St., 196, 197, 198, 199
 Malochanus, *de Malochani*, 3,
 4
 Manitus, 13, 50
 Manno, 29
 Mase (Mucoscorius), King, 199,

- 203
 Marenbon, John, 49, 188 nn1, 2,
 189 n21, 193 n67
 Marianne Scotus, 106 n22
 Marinus, Sp. of Arles, 86, 87,
 105 n15
 Marius Victorinus, 44 n52
 Martinianus Capella, *De Nuptiis*,
 24, 25, 27
 Martin Hiberniensis, 23, 25, 27,
 28, 29, 31-39, 44 n48; *De Epy-
 thetis Virgilio*, 36; Glossary
 on the letters of the poet
 Sedulius, 36
 Martinet, Suzanne, 44 n48
 Mathon, Gerard, 24, 26
 Meehan, Denis, 2
 Mercia, 50, 55
 Meyvaert, Paul, 147, 181, 190
 n23
 Milan, 86, 87, 89, 92
 Milred, Sp. of Worcester, 82
 n154
Miracula Myriam, 46, 54, 75 n87
 Mocan, Moniro, 92
 Mohrmann, Christine, 7, 8
 Morin, Germain, 2
 Morvannou, F., 195
 Mosinu macca Min, Abbot of Ban-
 gor, 92, 95, 108 n31
 Most, William George, 3
 Muirchú, 8, 15
 Mundó, Anscari, 166
 Mungret, Co. Limerick, 85
 Munnu of Tagham, St., 84, 85
 Murethach, *In Domiti Artan Mú-
 orum*, 2
 Mynors, R.A.S., 66 n1

 Manticarvan, 197, 198, 201
 Naples, 89
 New Minster, Winchester, 162,
 167
 Nemes, Council of, 86, 94, 97,
 146
 Ninian, St., 75 n87
 Norbury, Dag, 4
 North Africa, 6
 Northumbria, Northumbrians, 82,
 54, 90, 103 n2, 168
 Wareling (*Museuillo*), 81

 Oda, St., Abbot of Cluny, 58
 Ogilvy, J.D.A., 46, 51, 64 n19,
 153
Old English Martyrology, 50
 Old Minster, Winchester, 58, 59,
 62, 162, 168

- Origen, homilies on Numbers, 44
 n55
 Orlandi, G., 3
 Orsiana, *Synod of (AD 541)*, 108
 n36
 Osgar, 57
 Ossa, Ile d' (Ushard), 199
 Oswald, St., Abp. of York, 57,
 59, 100
 Oswald of Worcester, St., 61
 Oswald the Younger, 61, 64
 Oswiu, King of Northumbria, 97
 Ouessant. See Ossa, Ile d'
 Ovid, 11, 140
 Oxford, 174 n27

 Pachonius, St., 92, 93-94
 Pacificus of Verona, 180
 Page, Raymond, 64
 Paphnutius, St., 204
 Parker Chronicle, 167, 168
 Parkes, M.W., 72 n59
 Patrick, St., 3, 12, 17, 113, 86,
 87, 88, 199, 201-202, 208;
Opera, 15
 Paul, St., 85, 92
 Paulinus, St., Sp. of Wala, *Vita*
S. Felici, 113, 116
 Paulinus Aurelianus, St., 195,
 196, 197, 198, 199, 203
 Paulinus of Carmarthen, St., 197
 Paulinus of Perigueux, 119
 Paulus, Lucius Aemilius, 58
 Paulus de Paphos, 197
 Penn Chan, 197
 Penwith, 199
 Perphirius, 157
 Peterborough, 199
 Petronius of Africa, 90
 Philippus, commentary on Job,
 178
 Pirus, St., 198
 Plianchard, Alejandro, 59
 Plato, 32
 Pliny, 30
 Plummer, Charles, 65, 65 n1
 Poland, 160
 Pompeia, 197
 Porphyry, *Isagoge*, 33
 Poulin, Joseph-Claude, 193
 Praefatio *Opus*, 167 n30
 Priscian, 137
Prologus Opus, 90, 167 n30
Prophetia *Opus* *Novus Opus*,
 180, 182, 187
 Prosper of Aquitaine, St., 80,
 63, 119, 120-129
 Provanus, 86

Prudentius Aurelius Clemens,
Peristephanon, 9, 119, 124
Prudentius of Troyes, 24, 62
Pseudo-Anatolius, 87-88, 89;
Omnino Paschalis, 87, 89
Pseudo-Augustine, De Mirabilibus
Saeclis (or Sanctis) Scripturae, 6
Pseudo-Dionysius, 26
Pseudo-Dositheus, Heteromastax,
81 n41
Pseudo-Isidore, De Ordine Crea-
turarum, 3, 6; Liber de Sum-
mis, 9
Pyrrus, Ile de, 198
Pythagoras, 14

Quemadmodum Probati Possit Esse
Incolititer, 183, 187
Quintilian, 78 n50, 122
Quo Argumento Colligendum Sit
Deum Esse, 183, 187
Quomodo Quid Sit, 182
Quomodo Sancti et Simplices
aliqui Incommutabilia Sit Tri-
nitatis, 183, 187

Ramey, 18, 59-62, 79 n125
Raden, 209
Remigius of Auxerre, 25, 27
Restitutus of London, 87
Rheims, 170
Rhyssbach, 204
Rish, Pierre, 199
Richter, O.C.Th., 180
Rigault, 197
Robert of Hereford, 106 n22
Robinson, Armitage, 167
Robinson, Fred C., 123
Roman Africa, 87, 88, 89, 92;
see also North Africa
Roma, 87, 89, 91, 92
Rusier, James, 48
Ruhl, Franz, 187 n24
Ruinat, Thierry, 83

Sacredos Franky, 87
Saint Albans, 164
St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 87,
58, 97, 182
St. Benoît-sur-Loire, Fleury,
183 n2
St. Gall, 146
Saint-Germain-des-Près, 179,
180
Saint-Malo, 199
St. Peter's, Ghent, 57
St. Peter's Minor, Suster, 146

Sallust, 101
Salzburg, 58, 179
Salzburg Planisphere, 101
Samson, St., Ep. of Dol, 196-
197, 198, 200, 208
Schaller, Dieter, 58
Scholia Gregoriana Glossarum, 81
n41
Scilly, Isles, 199
Scott, Peter Dale, 136-137, 147
Secundinus, St., Ep. in Ireland,
Rymus (Rymon on St. Patrick),
15
Sedulius, 29, 36, 53, 62, 119,
121, 125; Carmen Paschale,
119-120; Opus Paschale, 119-
120
Sedulius Scottus, 28, 43 n39;
Commentum in Matorum Donatum
Grammaticum, 2; In Donati Ar-
tem Matorum, 2; In Eutypham,
2; In Priscianum, 2
Ségism, Abbot of Iona (AD 623-
652), 85, 96, 102
Seneca, 179
Sententiae Sancti Agutini ad
Isidori in Laude Compositi, 92
Sergillus, 9
Serrus, psmfices to Virgil, 32
Severus, Sulpicius, 97, 124;
Vita S. Martini, 119
Sheldon-Williams, I.P., 2
Shelton, William, 174 n27
St. Peter's Verum Esse Sine Veri-
tate, 182, 186
Sillan, Abbot of Bangor, 92
Silvester, Ep. of Rome, 86
Sime-Williams, Patrick, 50
Sisebut, King of the Visigoths,
100
Sistofole, 199
Smeraphus, Abbot of San Nihil,
160, 178 n50
Smit, Johannes Wilhelms, 8, 11-
12
Socrates, 32
Southwark, Southwarkians, 49,
50, 51, 63
Southwick, 174 n27
Spain, 6, 83, 88
Stanford, William Bedell, 14
Stephanus of Mainz, 30, 43 n43
Storvenon, William Henry, 48
Strocher, Karl, 45
Struch, Gerhard, 114, 126
Stubbs, William, 88, 78 n58
Supplicatio Romae, 97, 88

Swithun, St., 59
Symeon of Durham, Historia Re-
gum, 54, 61, 80 n136
Symon Semeonis, Itinerarium ab
Rybernia ad Terram Sanctam, 2
Synons, Thomas, 59

Tabennisi, 93
Taeger, Burkhard, 15
Taghamon, Co. Wexford, 84
Tales, 32
Tangl, Michael, 46, 50
Tatwine, Abp. of Canterbury,
51, 52; Ars Grammatica, 71 n58
Tegernsee, 179
Temple, Elsie, 153, 160
Thagaste, 89
Theodore, Abp., 47-48, 52, 97
Theodulf, Ep. of Orléans, 147;
"Epistola Modestini," 147;
Libri Carolini, 73 n76, 147,
181
Theophilus, 89
Theophilus, Ep. of Alexandria
(AD 385-412), 89, 107 n28
Theophilus, Ep. of Caesarea, 89;
Epistola Theophilii, 88
Thiel, Matthias, 11
Thomas of Cantimpré, Liber de
Natura Rerum, 70 n42
Thomson, Rodney, 56
Tireney, J.J., 2
Tirechan, 15
"Tolmacha Orosius," 168, 177
n70
Tours, 137, 144
Traube, Ludwig, 12
Tréguier, work of, 196
Tudual, St., 196, 197
Turlau, 207

Uhlfelder, Myra, 137-138
Umbaphel, 197
Utrecht Psalter, 159
Utrum Sacellum Tempus an Sacro-
rum Sacellum Tempus est
Arte Tempora, 182, 187
Uuenti (Guent), 197
Uuenti, 197
Venantius Fortunatus, 53, 119
Virgil, See Virgil
Vexin, Jean, 77 n109
Victor, Ep. of Rome (AD 180-
198), 88
Victorius, 109 n61; see also
Victorius of Aquitaine
Victorius of Aquitaine, 88, 93-

93, 95, 97, 107 n28, 109 n48;
Calculus, 92, 109 n51a; Chro-
nus Paschalis, 93; Lateranensis
Victorii, 108 n36
Vie de Guimard, 197, 203
Vie de Guimard, 196, 201, 204,
206, 207
Vie de Magloire, 196, 205, 209
Vie de Malo, 197
Vie de Pmi, 196, 206, 207, 209
Vie de Turlau, 203, 207
Vinnianus, Pentecostale, 13
Virgil, 11, 32, 39, 51, 134,
159
Virgil the Grammarian. See Vir-
gilius Maro Grammaticus
Virgilius, St., Ep. of Salzburg,
9, 14
Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, 4,
5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 38;
Epitomas, 13
Vita David, 204
Vita Iohannis Abbatis Reconnen-
sis, 108 n36
Vita Metris Sanctas Brigides,
15
Vita prima Simeonis, 196, 205
Vita of St. Boygine of Wexham,
63
Vita S. Birini, 63
Vita S. Bonifacii Archiepiscopi
Magoniaci, 46
Vita S. Caroli, 56 n1
Vita S. Indrastic, 63
Vita S. Monni Sine Pluribus,
84
Vita S. Rotti, 63
Vita S. Ruotardi, 63
Vita S. Simeonis, 15
Vita secunda Simeonis, 196, 205
Vitalinus, Ep. of Rome (AD 657-
672), 97, 109 n48

Walker, G.S.M., 2
Wallach, Leopold, 136, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000

